

THE UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

1960

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

modern language notes

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

VOL. LXXV, NO. 6, JUNE 1960

-
- 465 Weohstan's Sword. R. E. KASKE
- 468 "Brave Prick Song": An Answer to Sir Thomas Browne.
CAROL MADDISON
- 478 Something More About Rochester. LUCYLE HOOK
- 485 Early Examples of the Expressions "American language" and
"langue américaine." JOSEPH MÉDARD CARRIÈRE
- 488 Wordsworth on Byron: An Unpublished Letter to Southey.
CHESTER L. SHAVER
- 490 On Some Manuscripts of La Fontaine in America. JOHN C. LAPP
- 497 Charles Nodier and the Marquis de Sade. A. RICHARD OLIVER
- 502 Two Poems on Death by Juan Ramón Jiménez.
HOWARD T. YOUNG
- 507 Heines Kampf gegen die Tradition. LAURA HOFRICHTER

REVIEWS

- 514 THOMAS B. STROUP, ed., *The Selected Poems of George Daniel of Beswick 1616-1627* (S. K. HENINGER, JR.)
- 515 R. C. BALD, *Donne and the Drurys* (FRANK MANLEY)
- 517 JOSEPH E. DUNCAN, *The Revival of Metaphysical Poetry; the History of a Style, 1800 to the Present* (JOSEPH H. SUMMERS)
- 519 ALVAR ELLEGARD, *Darwin and the General Reader. The Reception of Darwin's Theory of Evolution in the British Periodical Press, 1859-1872* (JOHN C. GREENE)
- 525 JOSEPH ROSSI and ALFRED GALPIN, eds., *De Sanctis on Dante* (ANTHONY L. PELLEGRINI)
- 527 IRA O. WADE, *The Search for a New Voltaire* (FRANCIS J. CROWLEY)
- 529 JEAN-JACQUES ROUSSEAU, *Œuvres complètes. Vol. I: Les Confessions. Autres textes autobiographiques* (LESTER G. CROCKER)
- 532 UDO RUKSER, *Goethe in der hispanischen Welt* (HELMUT HATZFELD)
- 534 VICTOR HUGO, *Notre-Dame de Paris*, ed., MARQUIS-FRANÇOIS GUYARD (OLIN H. MOORE)
- 536 CHARLES AUGUSTIN SAINTE-BEUVE, *Correspondance générale, tome septième, 1847-1849, nouvelle série, tome I; tome huitième, 1849-1851, nouvelle série, tome II*, ed. JEAN BONNEROT (W. M. FROHOCK)
- 538 JAMES M. CLARK, ed. and trans., *Meister Eckhart. An Introduction to the Study of His Works with an Anthology of His Sermons* (RAYMOND IMMERWAHR)
- 540 RICHARD ALEWYN, *Über Hugo von Hofmannsthal* (EGON SCHWARZ)
- 543 ARNDT RUPRECHT, *Die ausgehende Wikingerzeit im Lichte der Runeninschriften* (STEFÁN EINARSSON)

modern language notes

NATHAN EDELMAN,
General Editor

WOLFGANG E. THORMANN,
Managing Assistant

DON CAMERON ALLEN
CHARLES R. ANDERSON
STEFÁN EINARSSON
JOHN FRECCERO
RENÉ N. GIRARD
J. LIONEL GOSSMAN
RICHARD H. GREEN
THOMAS R. HART, JR.
ANNA G. HATCHER
HAROLD JANTZ
WILLIAM H. McCLAIN
J. HILLIS MILLER
LAWRENCE J. ROSS
CHARLES S. SINGLETON
BRUCE W. WARDROPPER
EARL R. WASSERMAN

Published eight times annually, November through June. Subscription: \$8.00 in the United States; \$8.50 in Canada; \$8.50 in other countries. Single issue, \$1.25. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Md. Claims for replacement of missing numbers must be received within 3 months (6 months in the case of foreign subscribers) following publication of the number.

Contributors and publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped return envelope. In preparing manuscripts, contributors are requested to follow the MLA Style Sheet.

Entered as Second-class Matter at the Baltimore, Md. Postoffice. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Sec. 1103, Act of Congress of October 3, 1917, authorized July 16, 1964.

55

60

ary

al

tes

49

ed

of

V

o

r

roo

\$3

\$12

shon

8, M

ust

of

h

umbr

scrip

s, Th

Even

return

urs and

e, M

rate

ngres

(A

VO

5-1657

1800

theory

CRINI)

texts

ae)

-1849,

, ed.

dy of

m

o

r

through

s; \$3

e, \$1.5

should

18, M

must be

of h

umber

inscrip

es, Th

Even

return

ors a

e, M

rate o

ongre

modern language notes

VOL. LXXV, NO. 6, JUNE 1960

Weohstan's Sword

At a critical moment of the dragon-fight in *Beowulf*, as Wiglaf is on the point of coming to Beowulf's aid, the action is strangely interrupted by a reminiscence on the history of the sword he carries:

. . . gomel swyrd geteah,
þæt wæs mid eldum Eanmundes laf,
suna Ohteres. Ðam æt sæcce wearð,
wræcca[n] wineleasum, Weohstan bana
meces eegum, ond his magum ætbær
brunfagne helm, hringde byrnan,
eald sweord etonisc; þæt him Onela forgeaf,
his gædelinges guðgewædu,
fyrdsearo fuslic, no ymbe ða fæhðe spræc,
þeah ðe he his broðor bearn abredwade.
He frætwe geheold fela missera,
bill ond byrnan, oððæt his byre mihte
eorlscipe efnan swa his ærfæder;
geaf him ða mid Geatum guðgewæda,
æghwæs unrim, þa he of ealdre gewat,
frod on forðweg. (2610-25)¹

No wholly convincing argument, I believe, has ever been presented

¹Quotations are from Elliott van Kirk Dobbie (ed.), *Beowulf and Judith* (Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records, IV; New York, 1953).

for the relevance of this passage. The most plausible interpretation is probably that of Adrien Bonjour,² who finds the significance of the sword—together with the tangle of historic loyalties and enmities it briefly introduces—in the latent feud between Geats and Swedes and the prospect of its future renewal. The suggestion is an attractive one so far as it goes; in fact, if we remember the importance of the theme of Geatish-Swedish hostility in the whole second part of the poem (2200-3182), it is difficult to see how the passage could avoid carrying some such overtones. Yet as an attempt to explain the primary significance of the passage, this interpretation is weakened (apart from the amount of conjecture it necessitates about the historical facts themselves) by its apparent lack of relevance to anything in the immediate context. However pertinent such an allusion to the feud may be in a general way, this still seems an unlikely spot for it to be introduced—unless there is, as I believe, a more immediately relevant theme to be found in the passage along with it.

I interpret this history of Weohstan's sword as a device—somewhat like the accounts of Agamemnon's sceptre or the shields of Achilles and Aeneas³—serving primarily to amplify and further illustrate the important Germanic ideal of good retainership. To begin with, the passage is closely bounded in the poem by the retainership theme—preceded as it is by the account of the defection of the retainers and the return of Wiglaf (2596-2610); and followed by an assurance of Wiglaf's steadfastness (2625-30), his exhortation of the other retainers with its clear account of what is expected of them (2633-60), his exhortation and promise of help to Beowulf (2663-8), and finally the story of his heroic assistance (2669 ff.). The mention of the sword provides the excuse first for an allusion to the killing of Eanmund through the hostility of his uncle Onela; but the central figure of the little story is Weohstan, who throughout plays the part of ideal retainer in slaying the enemy of his lord, presenting the spoil to Onela, and receiving it again from Onela as the reward of loyal service.

Now this slaying of a brother's son by a retainer of the uncle is evidently regarded by the poet as a serious and perhaps questionable

² "Weohstan's Slaying of Eanmund," *English Studies*, xxvii (1946), 14-19; and *The Digressions in Beowulf* (Medium Aevum Monographs, v; Oxford, 1950), pp. 35-9.

³ *Il.*, II, 100-8; xviii, 478-607; *Aen.*, viii, 626-731.

affair in itself, no matter where the right lay; witness what certainly sounds like a comment on its irregularity:

peah ðe he his broðor bearn abredwade.

But this very irregularity in the situation—whatever its implications for Onela—serves only to highlight Weohstan's wisdom in choosing a retainer's proper course regardless, his courage and unquestioning loyalty in following it, and the trust and understanding between lord and retainer. The fact that the loyalty was to a mortal enemy of the Geats, who now claim his son's loyalty,⁴ helps throw the emphasis on retainership and its obligations themselves, as apart from other complicating relationships and considerations. One can almost hear the poet's "Swa sceal man don . . .," particularly in view of Weohstan's subsequent long life and prosperity (2623-5).

The pertinence of the passage to its context, then, lies in the parallel between the good retainership of Weohstan and that of his son Wiglaf; and in the contrast between Weohstan and the other retainers, who in an unambiguous situation, involving no ethical peculiarities, abandon their lord in time of need. The contrast is sharpened by the prominent mention of Weohstan's well-earned war-gear as against Wiglaf's references to the equipment fruitlessly bestowed on Beowulf's retainers, both here (2636-8) and in his later reproach (2864-72).

And perhaps there is one further comparison. The Weohstan story provides an example not only of ideal retainership, but apparently also of some violation of the ties of kinship, whether by Onela or Eanmund or both.⁵ In Wiglaf and the other retainers of Beowulf we have somewhat the reverse pattern; though Wiglaf is a retainer also, the poet chooses to motivate his right decision primarily by the claim of kinship:

⁴I pass over the question of the mysterious Geatish and Swedish connections of the Wægmundings; the only fact necessary here is that Weohstan was a faithful retainer under Onela the Swede as Wiglaf is under Beowulf the Geat, and that is clear from the poem itself.

⁵If, as I suspect, the violation is to be attributed to Eanmund so far as *Beowulf* is concerned, the contrast I am suggesting becomes a little clearer: a breach of kinship by a younger kinsman, set against the proper conduct of the young Wiglaf. Note the description of Eadgils and Eanmund and their action (2379-81); and that of Onela (2381-4), which seems an unlikely comment on a usurper. See Kemp Malone, *The Literary History of Hamlet* (Anglistische Forschungen, 59; Heidelberg, 1923), pp. 62-3, slightly modified in *Speculum*, xxvi (1951), 150; also R. W. Chambers, *Beowulf: An Introduction* (2nd ed. rev.; Cambridge, 1932), pp. 412-3.

It may be that by the introduction of Weohstan we are being shown a four-cornered pattern rather than a two-poled one: the duties of retainership ideally observed by Weohstan and violated by Beowulf's retainers; the duties of kinship violated by Onela/Eanmund and ideally observed by Wiglaf. The two situations would thus combine to form a balanced dramatic presentation of these two strong Germanic claims, each developed by the familiar juxtaposition of a positive and a negative example.⁶

Though this interpretation is itself independent of any preconceptions about the larger design of *Beowulf*, it can bear a quite natural connection to the *sapientia et fortitudo* heroic ideal which I believe to be the controlling theme of the poem.⁷ Wiglaf, in his subsequent speeches and actions, manifests the *sapientia et fortitudo* of a heroic young retainer; the other retainers seem to be shown as failing in both heroic virtues. Weohstan, who parallels Wiglaf and contrasts with the false retainers, is presented as having dealt successfully with an awkward situation apparently requiring the exercise of both *sapientia* and *fortitudo*: *sapientia* in deciding according to the demands of good retainership, and *fortitudo* in performing the violent duty called for.

University of North Carolina

R. E. KASKE

"Brave Prick Song": An Answer to Sir Thomas Browne

In his *Pseudoxia Epidemica* Sir Thomas Browne writes:

Many more [vulgar errors] there are whose serious enquiries we must request of others, and shall only awake considerations, . . . whether the Nightingale sitting with her breast against a thorn, be any more than that

⁶ The same principle obviously underlies the comparison of Sigemund and Heremod (874-915) and apparently that of Hama and Hygelac (1197-1214); see my article "The Sigemund-Heremod and Hama-Hygelac Passages in *Beowulf*," *PMLA*, LXXIV (December, 1959), 489-94.

⁷ See my article, "*Sapientia et Fortitudo* as the Controlling Theme of *Beowulf*," *SP*, LV (July, 1958), 423-56. The discussion of the retainers and of Wiglaf is on pp. 452-4.

she placeth some prickles on the outside of her nest, or roosteth in thorny prickly places, where Serpents may least approach her?¹

As far as one can gather from those who specialize in writing of the ecology of birds, there seems to be no basis for Sir Thomas Browne's first suggestion, that the nightingale rings her nest with thorns. There is, however, literary authority, at least, for the second, that the nightingale nests in thorny places to be safe. The usual literary enemy is the owl, not the serpent. However, the matter is more complicated than that; the image of the nightingale pressing her breast against a thorn is the creation of the religious imagination of the late middle ages and owes its popularity to the heightened sensibility that was a direct outcome of the Franciscan movement.

The nightingale became a religious symbol through her natural characteristics, not through any mythical associations. The Christian nightingale had little to do with the classical Philomela, although she appears under that name in medieval Latin poetry, rather than as the metrically intractable "luscinia." Neither had the Christian nightingale anything to do with the more exotic creatures of the bestiaries, or with the fables. The nightingale appears but rarely in these fanciful works. The nightingale also rarely appears in the *exempla*. The nightingale never served as a favourite illustration for all manner of allegorists over a period of a thousand years as did the pelican or the unicorn. Rather, she was the familiar bird of the spring, associated with the renewal of life, with joy, and with love, in all the literatures of medieval Europe. She sang all night, at dawn, and it happened that she sang at Easter. It was also noted that the nightingale roosted in thorny places. Gradually these various characteristics of the nightingale were given Christian allegorical interpretation. But it was not until the height of the Franciscan movement that the nightingale became a Christian symbol.

St. Ambrose was the first man to use the nightingale as a religious image. He compares the nightingale awake at night, singing as she warms her eggs, with the poor widow working into the night for her little ones, singing as she grinds her corn.² St. Ambrose's comparison was repeated throughout the middle ages, and, in St. Bernard and Hugo of St. Victor, the nightingale nurtured her young with her song (*canor*) as well as with her bodily warmth (*calor*).³

¹ *Works* (London, 1686), III, 148.

² *Hexameron*, PL, XIV, 239.

³ See, e.g., *Tonale S. Bernardi*, PL, CLXXXII, 1154-1166; Hugo of St. Victor,

However, at an early period, in the popular and much imitated *Laus de Philomela* by Julius Speratus, the nightingale sings at night to keep awake so that no evil power may harm her eggs.⁴ The nightingale teaches man to stay awake to fulfill his duty cheerfully, and how to remain vigilant against the onslaughts of evil.

A third literary passage combined with these other two to give the middle ages an image of the monk. In his second elegy to Lycoris, Maximian the Etruscan (first half of the sixth century) writes "Dulcius in solitis cantat philomela rubetis."⁵ Maximian was very popular as a school author during the middle ages and was much quoted.⁶ Neckam begins his chapter on the nightingale in *De Naturis Rerum* with the above quotation, and goes on to compare the nightingale singing on the thorn bushes with the monk who can contemplate better in the austerity of the monastery and who happily sings God's praises all night.⁷ In his *De Laudibus Divinae Sapientiae* Neckam prays, "Dummodo psalterium sit philomena mihi."⁸

Neckam's nightingale as an image of the monk appears again in the *Fabulae* (1247) of another Englishman, Odo of Cheriton.⁹ In the *Moralitates* of yet another Englishman, Robert Holkoth, we again find the nightingale as the image of the monk. Here there is a detailed comparison between the monastery and the thorn bush, the owl, and the Devil.¹⁰ In the fourteenth century Waldensian *Physio-*

De Bestiis et Aliis Rebus, PL, CLXXVII, 96B; Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum Naturale*, xvi, 102. Richard Rolle of Hampole, in *The Fire of Love*, ed. R. Harvey, *EETS*, cvi (1896), 75, writes that the lover of God must rouse others to love with song.

⁴ *Poetae Latini Minores*, ed. Lemaire (Paris, 1826), vii, 182.

⁵ *Ibid.*, vii, 234. We find the predilection of birds for the thorn noted as early as the apocryphal book of Baruch, 6: 70, "Spina alba, supra quam omnis avis sedet." It appears again in the middle ages as the habitat of the nightingale, in *The Poems of William Dunbar*, ed. J. Schipper in *Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Classe*, xl (Wien, 1892), II, 46. In the Renaissance we find that Ronsard's famous "Bel Aubepin" has a nightingale's nest and the nightingale still lives in the thorn in the eighteenth century; see Jos. Warton, "Ode I. To Fancy," in R. S. Crane, *A Collection of English Poems 1660-1800* (New York and London, 1932), p. 752.

⁶ Ernst Robert Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (London, 1953), pp. 50, 464 and footnotes on pp. 58, 113.

⁷ Alexander Neckam, *De Naturis Rerum*, ed. Wright (London, 1863), p. 102.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 390.

⁹ L. Hervieux, *Les Fabulistes latins* (Paris, 1896), iv, 213-214.

¹⁰ Robert Holkoth, *Moralitates*, ed. Jacques Ryter (Bale, 1586), pp. 732-3.

logus, the nightingale, with a different enemy to combat at night, a vine with quick growing tendrils, is the model of the good Christian.¹¹

The Franciscan movement, with its stress on feeling and pathos, transformed the more emphatically rational Christianity of the earlier middle ages. The wounds and sufferings of Christ were popular themes with preachers and painters and the constant subjects of meditation.¹² In this changed emotional climate, the nightingale that before endured the discomfort of the thorn bush to keep awake and safe at night, now pressed her breast against the thorn and suffered and sang, first to praise God, later to save mankind. The nightingale became the symbol of a saint, of the Christian soul, of the Virgin, of Christ.

We find the transitional stage between the first image of the nightingale and the Franciscan one in Barthelemy Aneau's late *Description philosophale de la nature et condition des oiseaux*. Here the nightingale presses her breast against the thorn, but only to keep awake to escape her traditional serpent enemy.¹³

The nightingale again presses her breast against the thorn to keep awake and safe from her enemies in Lydgate's "The Legende of St. Petronilla," the daughter of St. Peter martyred in May, but here the religious application of the image is made explicit. The nightingale is the saint who serves Jesus night and day.¹⁴ In John of Hoveden's *Philomena*, Christ is a nightingale¹⁵; in Lydgate's "Ballade at the Reverence of our Lady, Queen of Mercy," the Virgin Mary is a nightingale¹⁶; and in the same poet's "A Sayenge of the Nyghtyn-gale," the nightingale not only sings of the life of Christ but even becomes Christ.¹⁷

¹¹ A. Mayer, "Der Waldensische Physiologus," *Romanische Forschungen*, v (1890), 404.

¹² Fr. de Sessevalle, *Histoire générale de l'ordre de St. François*, I (Paris, 1935), 277; J. Huizinga, *The Waning of the Middle Ages* (New York, 1954), pp. 190-200; Etienne Gilson, "Saint Bonaventure et l'iconographie de la passion," *Revue d'Histoire Franciscaine*, I (1924), 405-424; see St. Francis, *Cantic of the Furnace* and the pseudo-Bonaventure, *Meditationes vitae Christi*.

¹³ Quoted by Eugène Rolland, *Faune populaire de la France*, II, *Les Oiseaux sauvages* (Paris, 1877), 270. Was this perhaps the source of Sir Thomas Browne's rather un-English suggestion that the nightingale took refuge in the thorn to escape the serpent?

¹⁴ *The Minor Poems of John Lydgate*, ed. H. N. MacCracken, *EETS*, e. s., cvii (1911), p. 158.

¹⁵ Op. cit., Blume (Leipzig, 1930), p. 67.

¹⁶ *Minor Poems of Lydgate*, p. 258.

¹⁷ See infra.

Before we examine the image of the nightingale as the suffering Christ, we must consider other traditions about the nightingale which combined to form the developed image.

The nightingale has always been renowned as a good singer. Thus it is hardly surprising that the nightingale's song should be interpreted from the earliest ages of Christianity as being to the glory of God. It is so stated in Juvenius,¹⁸ Eugenius Volgaris,¹⁹ Eustathius,²⁰ and finally in Thomson.²¹ In Alanus de Insulis the nightingale preaches of God,²² whereas after the time of St. Francis, the birds sing mass with the nightingale leading.²³ In Lydgate the birds sing the hours.²⁴

Isidore of Seville's typical false etymology of "lusciniā," "nightingale," from "LUC-," "light,"²⁵ constantly repeated throughout the middle ages,²⁶ had much to do with the later interpretation of the nightingale as an evangelist. The bird whose song announces the day (*pace Juliet*) easily becomes the type of the preacher, as in Raban Maur.²⁷ This nightingale finds her way into a religious "alba," "Rei glorios, verais lums e clardatz," by Giraud de Borneil,²⁸ and into the Old French "Imitation Pieuse d'une Chanson Adressée à un Rosignol."²⁹ In a poem attributed to Lydgate, a bird which appears to

¹⁸ Albi Ovidii Juvenius, *Elegia de Philomela*, *Poet. Lat. Min.*, VII, 279-288. This poem was printed in editions of Ovid by Aldus, Gryphus, etc., throughout the sixteenth century. It was only attributed to Juvenius in the seventeenth century by M. H. Goldast in *Erotica et Amatoria Opuscula* (Frankfurt, 1610), p. 71.

¹⁹ *The Parliament of Birds*, ed., Stephen Gaselee, *The Oxford Book of Medieval Latin Verse* (Oxford, 1952), pp. 58-61.

²⁰ Eustathius, *Hexaemeri Metaphrasis*, PL, LIII, 953.

²¹ James Thomson, *The Seasons*, "A Hymn," lls. 79-80.

²² *Liber de Planctu Naturae*, PL, CCX, 441.

²³ See the life of St. Francis by St. Bonaventure in *B. P. Francisci Assisiensis Opuscula*, ed. L. Wadding (Antverpiae, 1623), p. 551. For a bibliography of bird masses see Otto Glauning, John Lydgate's *Minor Poems The Two Nightingale Poems*, ed., Glauning, *EETS*, e. s., LXXX (1900), p. 52, note on line 5.

²⁴ See, e. g., *Reson and Sensualyte*, ed. Ernst Sieper, *EETS*, e. s., LXXXIV (London, 1901), p. 13.

²⁵ *Op. cit.*, PL, LXXXI, 464.

²⁶ See the references to St. Bernard, Hugo of St. Victor, and Vincent of Beauvais in footnote 3. See also the Venerable Hildebert of Lavardin, *De Ornatu Mundi*, PL, CLXXI, 1237, and fn. 27, *infra*.

²⁷ *De Universo*, PL, CXI, 247.

²⁸ F. J. M. Raynouard, *Choix des poésies originales des troubadours*, III (Paris, 1818), 313.

²⁹ A. Jeanroy, *Les Origines de la poésie lyrique en France au moyen âge* (Paris, 1889), pp. 487-8.

be the nightingale, a bird with "federes gray," stops the rider and bids him "' For þi sunnes a-Mendes make!'"³⁰

It is a fact of nature that the nightingale begins to sing about Easter. This is mentioned in Sedulius Scottus' "Carmen Paschale," where the nightingale sings, apparently unaware, on the night of Christ's resurrection.³¹ In Fortunatus' famous "Salve festa dies" which formed part of the liturgy, the song of the nightingale had formed part of the joyous celebration of Easter, sweetening the air with echoing melody.³² In its simplest form this song was "Rejoice, Christ is risen"³³; however, in the earliest beast epic of the middle ages, the nightingale sings of the passion of Christ, particularly lamenting the crown of thorns, and, from her too great grief, prays for death, despite the efforts of the other animals to cheer her.³⁴

Pliny the Elder tells that nightingales often strive to outdo one another in song and that the nightingale will die before it will stop singing.³⁵ In the middle ages another popular tradition stated that the nightingale knew when it was going to die and that it sang until death.³⁶

John Peckam, a Franciscan friar who was Archbishop of Canterbury from 1279 to 1292, gathered up all these strands and borrowed a few motifs from popular literature as well in his widely known *Philomena*, which passed for centuries as the work of St. Bonaventura, and hence became an integral part of the Catholic tradition.³⁷ Peckam's

³⁰ This poem, "Bi a wode as I gon ryde," was published by J. O. Halliwell in *A Selection from the Minor Poems of John Lydgate* (London, 1840), pp. 228-232. Here the "federes gray" rime with "say." The same poem was published by Carleton Brown in *Religious Lyrics of the Fourteenth Century* (Oxford, 1924), p. 196. Here the bird has "feperes blake," which rimes with "amendes make." The bird has changed its plumage to suit the rime scheme, but the gray feathers in the one case, as well as its admonitory role, suggest the nightingale as the bird, although it may be just "a bird."

³¹ Helen Waddell, *Medieval Latin Lyrics* (London, 1952), p. 130.

³² Jac. Grimm and Andr. Schmeller, *Lateinische Gedichte des X. und XI. Jhr.* (Göttingen, 1838), p. 322.

³³ Lydgate, *Minor Poems*, ed. Halliwell, pp. 78-80. This poem is rejected by MacCracken, Lydgate, *Minor Poems*, pp. xlvii-xlviii.

³⁴ See Grimm and Schmeller, *op. cit.*, pp. 243-285.

³⁵ This account of Pliny's is quoted by Vincent of Beauvais in *Speculum Naturale*, xvi, 102. This legend of the song competition appeared in medieval French poetry. Werner Hensel, "Die Vogel in der provenzalischen und nord-französischen Lyrik des Mittelalters," *Romanische Forschungen*, xxvi (1909), 612. It also appears in John Lyly's *Euphues and his England* (London, 1868), p. 422.

³⁶ F. J. E. Raby, "Philomena praevia temporis amoeni," *Mélanges Joseph de Ghellinck*, II (Gembloux, 1951), 445, 447.

³⁷ For a discussion of the authorship of this poem see *S. Bonaventurae Opera*

Philomena borrows its opening device from Provençal poetry. As the lover sends the nightingale as a messenger to his beloved, so Peckam sends the nightingale to his friend with a heavenly song. He tells his friend how the nightingale sings the day of its death, from dawn till noon, when it cries "oci, oci," then dies at three. This nightingale is a symbol of the soul full of virtue and love, which performs the kind of spiritual exercise taught by the Franciscans—and even by such later religious orders as the Jesuits.³⁸ During the hours of the day the nightingale, the devout soul, meditates, in the grey twilight of earliest morning, on Adam and unregenerate man; at six, in the rosy glow of dawn, on the birth of Christ; at nine on his life; at twelve on his suffering and crucifixion; and at three on his death. In Peckam's poem these meditations on the hours are followed by a series of meditations on the life of Christ which make a strong appeal to the sensibility.

In Peckam's poem we have, fused into a whole, most of the elements of allegory and symbolism that have been listed above. But Peckam's nightingale does not press her breast against a thorn. It was John of Hoveden, Peckam's contemporary, who made a pathetic image of the thorn, and John Lydgate, the monk of Bury, who developed the theme of the nightingale pressing her breast against the thorn.

John of Hoveden (d. c. 1278)³⁹ wrote, in a series of meditations on the sufferings of Christ which he called *Philomena*,

Me felicem, o spina, faceres,
Si compunctum cor mihi pungeres;
Pungas ergo, cum pungens superes
Haustus mellis et favos uberes.⁴⁰

Hoveden's nightingale who wanted her breast pierced by the thorn was the type of the devout soul, and, towards the end of the poem, clearly a symbol of Christ himself:

Omnia, VIII (Quaracchi, 1898), 669, fn. 3. Glauning, ed. Lydgate, *Two Nightingale Poems*, p. xxxix and F. J. E. Raby, *Christian Latin Poetry* (Oxford, 1953), p. 425 and "Philomena praevia, . . ." *Mélanges Ghellinck*, II, 444 attribute the poem definitely to Peckham. For the popularity of Peckham's *Philomena* see Glauning, loc. cit., and Raby, "Philomena praevia," pp. 447-8.

³⁸ See the references in fn. 12 and the *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius Loyola.

³⁹ Raby, "Philomena Praevia," p. 444. For the popularity of Hoveden's poem see pp. 447-8.

⁴⁰ Op. cit., p. 16.

Ecce, migrat caeli solatium
 Rosa veris et violarium,
 Melos lyrae, viellae gaudium
 Philomena promens praeconium.⁴¹

As is well known, this desire to endure the sufferings of Christ was typical of the Franciscan movement—we have only to think of the stigmata of St. Francis. Thus in a late medieval hymn, "Iesu meae deliciae,"⁴² which formed part of the Gallic Breviary,⁴³ we find the poet addressing Christ's nails, calling them the darts of love, and bidding them wound him sweetly, and transfix his heart. It is not surprising that the nightingale of this period presses her breast against the thorn.

About the middle of the fifteenth century, Lydgate wrote two poems about the nightingale. The first poem, called simply *The Nightingale*, was written in the second half of 1446⁴⁴ and is based on Peckam's *Philomena*. This time "the Latin book in which he found the story" (lls. 106-109) is more than the familiar medieval *topos*. Here the nightingale sings, waking the poet, and bids him get up. He finds the bird on a laurel, singing of her death. She sings through the hours. At tierce and sexte she cries "ocy, ocy." At none she dies. This story Lydgate found written in a Latin book along with its moral, which he now translates into English. The nightingale is an allegory of Christ and of every Christian soul which should always remember what each hour of the day symbolizes.

Lydgate's second poem, apparently written later, is more interesting from our point of view. In "A Sayenge of the Nyghtyngale" the poet finds a nightingale singing "occy," "occy," with her breast pressed against a thorn. Later an angel comes to him in a dream and tells him the meaning of the bird's song. The nightingale is not singing of carnal love, but of the great love of Jesus for mankind and of his pains and suffering. She cries "kill" at those who do not pity and love Jesus, or, on another interpretation, she begs to be killed because of her great love. Towards the end of the poem the nightingale, calling from the thorn, is the Christ of the allegorized Song of Songs calling man's soul to Paradise.

After the fifteenth century the Old French "oci" disappears from

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 67.

⁴² H. A. Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnologicus* (Halis, 1841), II, 350.

⁴³ For the date and source see Daniel, IV, 312-313, 321.

⁴⁴ Glauning, p. xxxviii. The text of the two poems is quoted from Glauning.

the English tradition. Anglo-Norman is no longer understood. The typical English bird calls "Jug, jug."⁴⁵ The nightingale with her breast upon the thorn, however, survives into the nineteenth century when she becomes the symbol of the poet suffering to create.

Ronsard knew that the nightingale sat upon the thorn but not the reason for it. Therefore, in one passage he contaminated the medieval nightingale on the thorn with the classical Philomela as the English Renaissance poets Lyly, Sidney, and Barnefield were to do after him, "l'Oiseau qui maudit Teré sur une espine."⁴⁶ Elsewhere the nightingale sings not only on the thorn but also at dawn, yet, with no memory of the Christian tradition, Ronsard makes his nightingale sing of worldly love,

Marie, levez-vous ma jeune paresseuse,
Ja la gaye Alouette au ciel a fredonné,
Et ja le Rossignol doucement jargonné
Dessus l'espine assis, sa complainte amoureuse.⁴⁷

Laumonier does not annotate either of these passages in his edition of the *Oeuvres Complètes de Ronsard* (Paris, 1914-19), but in his critical edition of Ronsard's works, VII (Paris, 1934), he has the following note on "Dessus l'espine assis,"

Expression latine: "Ramo sedens," dit Virgile en parlant du rossignol (Georg. IV, 514).⁴⁸

To such feebleness can source hunting sometimes reduce the best scholars! There is, of course, no authority for interpreting "thorn" as "branch" in any historical dictionary of the French language. If he had wanted to, Ronsard could have placed his bird on a branch, as had so many troubadours before him, no doubt echoing Virgil! There was no compelling reason of metre or rime why he should not have done so. Ronsard placed his nightingale on a thorn because that was part of a tradition with which he was half familiar. If Laumonier had wanted an ancient source he would have done better to have picked Maximian with his "rubetis."

⁴⁵ See John Skelton, "To Mistress Isabell Pennell"; John Lyly, *Campaspe*, v, i, 34; Thomas Nashe, "Spring," refrain; Coleridge, "The Nightingale," line 60; and Eliot, *The Waste Land*, line 204.

⁴⁶ *Oeuvres complètes de Ronsard*, ed. P. Laumonier (Paris, 1914-19), I, 140.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, I, 147. It is interesting to note that when Ronsard is writing to the learned Cassandre the nightingale is always the mythical Philomela (see *Amours* I, 160, for example), whereas, when he is writing to the simple Marie, Ronsard feels that he can also use the more popular medieval tradition.

⁴⁸ *Fn.* 2, 140.

Our study of the medieval Christian nightingale will help to fill out another scholarly note. In Act V, scene 1 of *Campaspe* Trico sings

What bird so sings, yet so does wail?
O 'tis the ravish'd nightingale.
Jug, jug, jug, jug, tereu! she cries,
And still her woes at midnight rise.
Brave prick-song.

R. W. Bond in his edition of Lyly's *Works* has the following note on "prick song":

properly written music, alluding to the points or dots of musical notation, and applied to the nightingale's song as more regularly musical than that of other birds. (Nares).⁴⁹

Bond and his authority are, of course, half right. Songs with music were called "prick songs." However, surely the witty Lyly intended an ambiguity. His contemporaries knew that the nightingale presses her breast against a thorn. Sir Philip Sidney wrote in "Philomela," "The Nightingale . . . Sings out her woes, a thorn her song-book making,"⁵⁰ and we read in Richard Barnefield's "Philomel," a poem often attributed to Shakespeare, "She, poor bird, as all forlorn / Lean'd her breast up till a thorn."⁵¹ In Act 2, scene 2 of *The Spanish Tragedy*, Bel-imperia says to Horatio, in a passage that recalls Juliet, that "the gentle Nightingale / Shall carroll us a sleepe, . . . / . . . singing with the prickle at her breast."⁵² Finally Richard Barnefield in another poem, "The Shepheards Content," which contains a lament on the death of Sidney, shows to what wit "prick song" could lend itself,

No Briefes nor Semi-Briefes are in my Songs,
Because (alas) my griefe is seldome short;
My Prick-Song's alwayes full of Largues and Longs, . . .
Prick-song (indeed) because it pricks my hart.⁵³

In this milieu Lyly's "brave prick song" could not have been a simple expression.

Her breast against a thorn is the traditional attitude of the nightin-

⁴⁹ *The Complete Works of John Lyly*, II (Oxford, 1902), 551.

⁵⁰ Sir Philip Sidney, *Complete Works*, ed. A. Feuillerat (Cambridge, 1922), II, 303.

⁵¹ *The New Oxford Book of English Verse*, ed. Sir A. Quiller-Couch, pp. 238-9.

⁵² Lines 48-52.

⁵³ *The Complete Poems of Richard Barnefield*, ed. A. B. Grosart, p. 37.

gale during the Renaissance and the eighteenth century. We find it in Giles Fletcher the younger's *Christs Victorie and Triumph*,⁵⁴ in Edward Young's *Night-Thoughts*,⁵⁵ and in Thomas Hood's "The Plea of the Midsummer Fairies."⁵⁶ But the bird could not press her breast against a thorn for no reason but tradition for long. It was inevitable, once the religious origin of the action was forgotten, that it should be reinterpreted. As the Weltanschauung changes and the sensitive soul suffers to create, the nightingale becomes the symbol of the poet. We find this interpretation of the nightingale in Anne Finch, Countess of Winchelsea's, "To the Nightingale"⁵⁷ and in Elizabeth Barrett Browning's *The Lost Bower*.⁵⁸ And perhaps Shelley's falling upon the thorns of life is a reminiscence of this transformed medieval symbol.

Paris

CAROL MADDISON

Something More About Rochester

The problems of authenticity and dating of the fugitive poems of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, continue to be of interest to scholars of the 17th Century. In examining some letters from the papers of the Earls of Huntingdon in the Huntington Library, San Marino, California, I found new information which applies to four poems generally attributed to Rochester. They are "The Debauchee" (I rise at Eleven, I dine about Two); "A Ramble in St. James's Park" (Much Wine had past with grave discourse); "On the Women about Town" (Too long the wise Commons have been in Debate); and "The Dispute" (Betwixt Father Patrick and his Highness of late). Besides supplying a limiting date of composition for each of the above poems, the Huntingdon letters add twelve new lines to "The Dispute," as well as significant variants to "The Debauchee," "On the Women about Town," and "The Dispute."

The inclusion of the verses in the letters furnishes an interesting glimpse of the manner in which political and personal gossip, satirical poetry, and lampoons were disseminated from London to the country

⁵⁴ Stanza 66.

⁵⁵ Lines 438-440.

⁵⁶ Lines 269-270.

⁵⁷ Lines 12-13.

⁵⁸ Stanza 39.

in the 17th Century. Also, these few letters, which were written over a period of nearly four years, give a small but vivid picture of the times and a contemporary appraisal of the most celebrated wit and satirist of the Restoration period, the Earl of Rochester.

Beginning in 1671, the letters are addressed to twenty-one year old Theophilus, 7th Earl of Huntingdon, at Donnington Park, Leicestershire, from a distant and rather amoral cousin by the name of Godfrey Thacker, who signs himself "Your Faithfull Anonimous." Thacker, who was a solicitor, had been engaged in making discreet inquiries for the Earl about the dowries of certain heiresses with an eye to an advantageous marriage to mend the depleted fortunes of the Huntingdons. But such solemn activities were soon abandoned, and the Earl found in Thacker a willing purveyor of London news and scandals, and most important, copies of the latest lampoons and bawdy verses. If nothing came to hand, Thacker regaled his youthful correspondent with obviously fictional accounts of his own debauches, in one letter with the climax written in Latin (HA 12524).

In a letter dated March 20, 1672/3 (HA 12525), Rochester is mentioned for the first time, but there is no doubt from the text that there was an earlier correspondence about him that unfortunately is missing from the Huntingdon Papers. Thacker begins with a story about Rochester without mentioning his name, but when the entire letter is examined, it is easy to see that Rochester is the subject:

I acknowledge the favour of your last letter; I had sooner answered it, if by the immediate post before, I had not given your Ldship an account of some small adventures of the person you desired an information of; I must confess I was glad when I saw your request, since I often condemned my selfe for spreading reports on persons of that dignitie whose honour and reputation ought rather to bee admird, then villified by all of my mean ranck and qualitie. I could wish this letter would contradict my former; but it is so farr from it, that it is rather a confermation of it; since his pore lady is now not onely under the doctors hands; but under the suspition, of all that know them; to have been injurd by him. I never was in Hatton garden since my comeing to towne; and so can give you no account of the coffin.

From the context of the letter, then, there is no doubt that the Earl had asked in an earlier letter for all the gossip about Rochester, that Thacker had obliged with a story which unfortunately is lost, and while vowing reluctance to be relaying scandalous stories about a nobleman, insists upon the truth of his former letter and adds the current rumor about Rochester's cruel treatment of his wife. The

last sentence referring to Hatton Garden may be connected with the previous story about Rochester in which a coffin figured prominently, certainly an adventure (if we but knew it) to compare with the Alexander Bendo episode, the famous sun-dial wrecking at Whitehall, the frolic at Woodstock, or the Rose Alley Ambuscade.

Thacker continues the letter with a ribald account of his own conquest of "an indifferent pritty Catholique Mistress; that hath gott a dispensation to feed on flesh this lent" that flaunts his unmistakable Protestant leanings while gratifying the desire of the young Earl to partake of the bawdy life of the great city by proxy. He adds a postscript in which he mentions Rochester for the first time by name and casually assigns the authorship of a short version of "The Debauchee" to Buckhurst:

My Lord Buckhurst and Lord Rochester being in company, a suddaine melancholly possest him Rochester inquiring the reason hee answered he was troubled at Roch[est]ers lude way of living, and in thes verses he exprest it

You rise at Eleaven
You dine at two
You get drunk at Seaven
And have noting to doe
You goe to a wentch but feare of a clapp
You spend in your hand or spue in her lapp

The first complete version of this poem, which is expanded to fourteen lines from the above tetrameter quatrain, is included in *Poems on Several Occasions* (Antwerp, 1680), edited in 1950 by James Thorpe, who writes in a footnote: "This poem is ascribed to Rochester on slight evidence; it appears, attributed to him, in 1685 and 1739." In March, 1673, Godfrey Thacker attributed the first version, at least, to Lord Buckhurst, thus supplying a limiting date for its composition though perhaps further obfuscating its authorship for those who read into Thacker's efforts to provide a good setting for the naughty lines that Buckhurst was quoting Rochester's own verses to him in raillery.

In the same letter dated March 20, 1672/3, Thacker continues, "I send your L^d ship a copy of verses of my L^d Rochester's making though inferiour to those of St James his Parke," thus supplying a limiting date and Rochester authorship to "A Ramble in St. James's Park" and confirming Thorpe's statement, "I know of no evidence which indicates that Rochester was not the author of these lewd verses."

Thacker does not supply a title for the poem which he thought

inferior to "St James his Parke." John Hayward entitles it "On the Women about Town" in *The Collected Works of . . . Rochester* (1926), but in the first printed version (*Poems on Affairs of State*, Vol. III, 1704), it is entitled "Satyr." Since there is a marked difference between the several 18th Century versions, Thacker's manuscript copy will solve the question of the extra lines included in one and absent in another and re-affirm the name of Fox in the later editions instead of Cox in the 1704 printing.

Too long the wise commons have ben in debate
about mony and conscience those trifles of state
Whilst daingerous grievances dayly increase
and the subject cannot ryot in safty and peace
unless as gainst Irish cattle before
wee now pass an act to forbid Irish whore

The Coots black and white Clanbrazill and ffox
invade us with impudence, beuty, and Pox
They carry a fate no man can oppose
The loss of his heart and the fall of his nose
Should he dully resist, yet would each take uppon her
to beseech him to doo't and ingage him in honour

O yee mercifull powers who of mortalls take care
Make women more modest, more sound or less Faire
Is it just that with love cruell death can conspire
That our tailes should bee burnt by our hearts set on fire?
There's an end of communion, if humble beleveres
Must bee damed in the cupp like unworthy receivers.

Thacker's inclusion of this poem in his letter of March 20, 1672/3, gives a limiting dating and authenticity to an otherwise doubtful piece—doubtful because of its late appearance in the Rochester canon.

Still under orders from the Earl to send diverting reading matter, in a letter dated April 3, 1673 (HA 12526), Thacker tells of his defence of the Earl's honor and the "wish the devell might ride booted and spurrd and a Harrow at his taile" through those who sought to defame him. He adds,

I have laid out, to two, or three Booksellers for l'escole des filles, and doe not feare but to gain it if it bee in towne, without thinking any paines a trouble, that is for your satisfaction;

It is an interesting coincidence that on the same day and in the same post another letter (HA 1775) went from London to the Earl from Miss Bridget Croft, another distant relative but of a distinctly religious bent, who ended her letter,

. . . & God be praised many persons of honor noble Lords are now come to thinke it best to owne religion that have made a scorne of it my Lord Buckhurst my lord Rochester and even Sr Charles Sidley receaveing ye communion on Sunday last & many more y^t intend to doe next Sunday & hope y^r Lod^{sh}p has not failed to doe it. . . .

It is evident from the next letter the type of book the Earl had ordered, for on April 15, 1673 (HA 12527), Thacker reports on both the book and mentions Rochester:

I have at length procured the little booke you was pleasd to employ mee about and wait some opportunity to convey it; its bulke is betwixt the post and the carrier and fitt for neither but I question not but this terme will procure its passage I refused one with cutts for two reasons (viz) the confounded extortion in the price and the small necessity your L^dship hath for such helpe in your ingenious fancy; I have been in quest of some more of my L^d Rochesters ingenuitie but cannot as yet accomplish my desires but in the meantime I present you with a copy that is stolne from one to another a bout towne and fortunately this morning came to my hands.

He gives the title of "His highness his conversion by father Patrick" to the verses which appeared first as "The Dispute" in *State-Poems* (London, 1699). The important difference between the 1699 printed version and Thacker's manuscript is that there are twelve additional lines, ten inserted after the first eight lines in the usual printed version and two more inserted before the rhymed three-line closing. No attempt to point out variant readings can be made here, but the new lines are inclosed in quotation marks.

"His highness his conversion by father Patrick"

 Betwixt father Patrick and his highness of late,
 There hapned a strongue and a weighty debate,
 And religion the theame, tis strainge that they two
 Should dispute about that thay neither of them knew,
 For I dare boldly say if the Duke had but known
 The weakness of Patrick, and the strength of his owne,
 It had beene a madness, and much like to a curse
 To have chainged from a true one to one thats much worse
 "For if it bee true as some waggs make us think
 " That a Papist of all his five senses must wink,
 " A mans no more a man when hees wakeing than sleeping
 " As long as father Patrick hath his senses in keeping
 " But sure its not soe wee must all bee mistaken,
 " And have liv'd in a dreame, and are just now a waken,
 " ffor Patrick was mighty in word and in reason
 " Hee urg'd not a syllable, but it came soe in season,

"That every argument was stronger and stronger
 "So the Duke cri'd at last I can hold out no longer"
 The reason that mov'd most his highness to yeild
 And so willingly quit to ffather Patrick the feild,
 Was first that they cheated and left you i'th lurch
 That told you there could be any more then one church
 And next hee aver'd to the Duk for a certaine
 Noe footsteps of our Church could be found before Martin
 And at these two great reasons so full and profound
 The duke had much a doe not to fall in a swound
 And straite hee cri'd out father Patrick I find
 Bye suddain conversion and chaing of my mind
 That neither your witt nor your learning could afford
 Such strength of your cause twas the finger of y^e Lord
 ffor now I remember hee somewhere hath said
 That from babes and from sucklings his truth is convey'd
 "And therefore I submitt for my consciences ease
 "To be led by the nose as your ffathership please"
 Soe ended the Matter twixt y^e priest and the Knight
 For which to speake true and to all sides doe right
 hee managed this matter, as hee did the sea fight.

Whether or not this poem is assigned to Rochester by Thacker depends upon the interpretation of the word "ingenuitie." If Thacker is informing his noble kinsman that unfortunately he cannot find another typically naughty set of verses by Rochester but is sending one of his political lampoons that has just come to hand, then Thacker by implication is attributing "His highness his conversion by father Patrick" to Rochester. On the other hand, if Thacker uses the term "ingenuitie" to designate all of Rochester's verse and deplores that, since there is nothing available, he must substitute "His highness his conversion by father Pattrick," he is passing on to the Earl one of the many lampoons written by anonymous wits and circulated from tavern to coffee-house, through the pits of the theatres, finally reaching those unfortunately immured in the country.

If this manuscript copy of "The Dispute" is Rochester's, it proves, if nothing else, the reliability of the author as a collector and purveyor of the latest court gossip. The additional twelve lines and the date of the letter point up the controversy raging at the time about the Duke of York's conversion to Catholicism. The Duchess of York died a professed Catholic on March 31, 1671. One of the priests who attended her was Father Patrick O'Duffy, an Irish Franciscan, who had been appointed one of Queen Catherine's almoners and priests

when she arrived in England in 1662. Known also as Dom Patricio, he was famous as a proselytizer in court circles.

The line, "as hee did the sea fight," refers to the manner in which the Second Dutch War, which started in March, 1672, and petered out ingloriously in September of the same year, was conducted by the Duke of York, to the disgust of Prince Rupert and the Earl of Shaftesbury. By March 29, 1673, the Protestants had succeeded in ousting James from all his offices by forcing through Parliament the Test Act, which prohibited all persons from civil or military employment who would not declare their adherence to the Protestant religion. There was good reason for the wholesale taking of communion as reported by Bridget Croft, not as an act of contrition and an indication of reform but as a political move and public declaration of sides.

During this time, the question of whether or not James, the heir to the throne, was a Catholic was a burning issue, and the complete poem in the letter of April 15, 1673, proves the accuracy of the author's (whether Rochester or one of his lampooning friends) information about court secrets. Although the general public was not aware of the Duke's final conversion to Catholicism for years, the author of the poem gave a plausible account within two weeks of the Test Act, and the verses were on their way from city to country. As innocuous as the poem seems today, when Thacker wrote, "I present you with a copy that is stolne from one to another about towne," he was not indulging in metaphor.

One may speculate as to why the twelve extra lines were not included in the first appearance of the poem entitled "The Dispute" in *State-Poems* printed in 1699. Without the twelve deleted lines, the poem carries little of the satiric accusation of stupidity and cowardice against the Duke of York that the author intended. It is not surprising, however, to find the extra lines against the future James II carefully preserved among the papers of the ardent Protestant Huntingdon family.

On August 23, 1673 (HA 12529), Thacker reports,

... with in short time after my receipt of your last, I went out of towne for the refreshment of the Ayre, and the convenience of the wells At my returne I found the towne so Barren of companie and ingenuitie, that I could not find any Lampoon, or newes that might be gratefull to you; and having too great a sence of the weakness of that insipid matter I used to stuff my letters with all durst not expose the barroness of my braines, with out some other mirth inclosed to palliate your trouble in the reading. There hath been some time abroad a companie of little treasonable Pamphlets that are onely

ingenious because desperate; and scurrilous amongst which I think this inclosed the best but cannot assure my selfe it is new to you. . . .

Unfortunately, it is not possible to identify the little treasonable pamphlet, but a considered guess is that Thacker had chosen to send one of the many veiled attacks on the Duke of York in the imminent struggle between the Catholic and Protestant forces and the rising power of Monmouth.

The Thacker letters, while not important in themselves, not only supply a few new lines and some variant readings and dates to several poems commonly attributed to Rochester, but also give interesting glimpses of the way in which he was regarded at the height of his mercurial career. By the older generation, he was viewed with alarm as a bad example and a corrupter of morals, but by the generation represented by the young Earl of Huntingdon, his escapades, his verses and lampoons, his every word and action carried a fascination that is as fresh today to a 17th Century scholar as he reads these inconsequential letters as they were when Godfrey Thacker added the postscript to one of them reading, "A direction to Grayes Inn cannot Miss Mee, ffeb y^e 15 1672."

Barnard College

LUCYLE HOOK

Early Examples of the Expressions

"American language" and "langue américaine"

Under the entry *AMERICAN used as an adjective designating the English language as spoken or written in the United States, the *DAE* and the *Dictionary of Americanisms on Historical Principles* both give 1802 as the date of the earliest occurrence of the expression "American language."¹ Allen Walker Read, in an article unnoticed by the compilers of these two works, had already pointed out that the term "American language" is to be found in the introduction to

¹"To express my idea still more clearly, and in American language." Quoted from the *Annals of the Congress of the United States*, 7th Congress, I Session, Column 687 (Washington, Gales and Seaton, 1851). See *A Dictionary of American English on Historical Principles* (Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1938), I, 41; and *A Dictionary of Americanisms on Historical Principles* (Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1951), I, 26. One also finds in the *DAE* "American Dialect" (1740) and "American tongue" (1789).

Dr. William Thornton's *Cadmus: or, a Treatise on the Elements of Written Language*, printed in Philadelphia in 1793.² The history of "American language" can, however, be carried back still farther.

An unpublished letter which Louis-Guillaume Otto, French Chargé d'Affaires in the United States, wrote on June 15, 1786, to Vergennes, Minister of Foreign Affairs under Louis XVI, contains the following paragraph:

Le traité de Commerce avec le Roi de Prusse, Monseigneur, a enfin été ratifié le 17. du mois dernier; on a profité du moment où il y avoit neuf Etats représentés pour terminer une affaire qui avoit été différée pendant six mois. C'est le premier acte public dans lequel le Congrès appelle sa langue la *langue américaine*³ et l'on se propose d'introduire ce stile pour l'avenir.⁴

The text of the treaty, written both in French and English, fails to reveal the occurrence of the words "American language." This expression is found, however, in the preamble of the official act of ratification, where the document is described as "written both in the American and French languages."⁵

Yet, contrary to what Otto wrote to Vergennes, this was not the first time the words "American language" had been used, with that particular connotation, by the Continental Congress. It occurs in the account of the proceedings of that body for January 23, 1783:

The Report of the Com^e. [Committee] as agreed to hav^e. left a blank in the act of ratification for the insertion of the Treaty & Convention, & these being contained both in the Dutch & American languages the former column signed by the Dutch Plenip^s. only & the latter by Mr. Adams only, the Sec^y. asked the direction of Congress whether both columns or the American only ought to be inserted.⁶

² A. W. Read, "American Projects for an Academy to Regulate Speech," *PMLA*, LI (Dec. 1936), 1142. The expression "American language" occurs on p. vii of Thornton's work.

³ Underlined in the original.

⁴ Archives des Affaires Etrangères. Correspondance Politique. Etats-Unis, vol. 31, folio 407^{vo}. Transcripts and photographic copies of this correspondence will be found at the Library of Congress. Concerning Otto, see Gilbert Chinard, "Les Papiers américains de Louis-Guillaume Otto, Comte de Mosloy," *Bulletin de l'Institut Français de Washington*, xvi (1943), 9-37.

⁵ *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789*. Edited from the Original Records in the Library of Congress by John C. Fitzpatrick. Vol. xxx. 1786. January 2-July 31 (Washington, D. C., United States Government Printing Office, 1934), 269. For the text of the treaty, see pp. 269-284.

⁶ *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789*. Edited from the Original Records in the Library of Congress by Gaillard Hunt. Vol. xxv. 1783. September 1-December 31 (Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1922), 858.

An unrecorded occurrence of "langue américaine" and its English equivalent "American language" will also be found in a French book and an English review of it, both published in 1791. In his *Nouveau Voyage aux Etats-Unis de l'Amérique septentrionale*,⁷ the French writer and humanitarian, Brissot de Warville, points out that the diversity of languages constitutes one of the major obstacles to harmony and mutual understanding among nations. He argues that by borrowing words and constructions from each other's language nations would lower linguistic barriers and facilitate communications between one another. Since America must be the haven of all men and entertain relations with all the peoples of the earth, and, moreover, since Americans must try to draw close to those with whom they have the greatest interchange of ideas, particularly the French, he feels they should introduce into their language constructions peculiar to French. He then closes his argument with the following remark:

"Il y a double avantage dans la méthode de naturalisation universelle que je propose: les Américains se rapprochent des autres peuples, et ils s'éloignent des Anglois; ils fabriquent une langue qui leur sera propre, et alors il y aura une langue américaine."⁸

Brissot's book, marked by strong anti-British bias, was violently attacked some months later in the London magazine, *The Monthly Review*. In the course of his denunciation of the Frenchman's prejudices, the anonymous critic reproduces in translation several passages from Brissot's work. Among these excerpts is the one cited above, which ends with the words: ". . . we should then have an *American language*."⁹ In the English translation of the *Nouveau Voyage dans les Etats-Unis de l'Amérique septentrionale*, which appeared in 1792, however, the expression "American language" is not to be found in

⁷ Paris, 3 vols. The complete title of the work is: *Nouveau Voyage dans les Etats-Unis de l'Amérique septentrionale, fait en 1788*. Concerning Jacques Pierre Brissot de Warville (1754-1793), an ardent admirer of the American form of government and a political victim of the French Revolution, which sent him to the guillotine, see Eloise Ellery, *Brissot de Warville. A Study in the History of the French Revolution*. Reprinted from the Vassar Semi-Centennial Series (Cambridge, Mass., The Riverside Press, 1915, xix-528 pp.). Pp 59-90 deal with his trip to the United States, which occurred in 1788.

⁸ I, 99-100. The italics are mine. Brissot de Warville's dissertation on the desirability for Americans to create a distinctive language of their own covers slightly more than two pages; it begins at the bottom of p. 97 and ends at the top of p. 100.

⁹ See "Appendix," *The Monthly Review Enlarged*, VI (1791), 535. The italics are those of the anonymous critic.

it, as the section of the French original where "langue américaine" occurs was omitted by the translator.¹⁰

The University of Virginia

JOSEPH MÉDARD CARRIÈRE

Wordsworth on Byron: An Unpublished Letter to Southey

Towards the end of 1821 Byron's quarrel with Southey was full-fledged. In an appendix to *The Two Foscari*, published on December 21, he went so far as to accuse Southey of slander. "I am not ignorant," he said, "of Mr. Southey's calumnies . . . which he scattered abroad on his return from Switzerland against me and others."¹

Southey could not well disregard such an imputation. To be labeled a political turncoat, as Byron labeled him in much of the appendix, was embarrassing enough; but to be charged with slander was an affront to his honor. That he must publicly answer the accusation was obvious. The method he adopted was a letter dated January 5, 1822, and printed in the *London Courier*.²

Before drafting this reply Southey apparently discussed it with Wordsworth. The evidence is a hitherto unpublished letter in which Wordsworth offered him advice, speaking, it would seem, for the family circle at Rydal Mount. Byron is not mentioned by name, but his identity is clear from the contents, which include verses (presumably Wordsworth's) on his recently issued *Cain*.³ The letter reads as follows:

Dear S—

The only part of the charge you are any way called upon to notice is that

¹⁰ *New Travels in the United States of America. Performed in 1788.* Translated from the French (London, J. S. Jordan, 1792 and 1794; Dublin, P. Byrne, 1792; New York, Berry and Rogers, 1792; Boston, Joseph Bumstead, 1797).

¹ R. E. Prothero, ed., *The Works of Lord Byron: Letters and Journals*. 6 vols. (London, 1901), vi, 389. Byron supposed that when Southey returned from Switzerland in 1817, he reported Byron and Shelley to be "in a league of Incest."

² Reprinted by Prothero, loc. cit.

³ As *Cain* appeared on December 19, 1821, the letter, which is without date or postmark, was written later; and as it lacks addresses, it probably went from Rydal Mount to Keswick by hand. I am indebted to the owner, Mr. Roger W. Barrett, for his generous permission to publish it and to Miss Helen Darbishire for the assurance that it is entirely in Wordsworth's autograph.

of slander, as this is given with his name, we think it ought to be met. As to the rest— one would never think of it but for the opportunity it gives of chastising the offender. Ever yours most faithfully,

W W—

Turn over—

The Girls may be amused—⁴

Critics, right honorable Bard! decree
Laurels to some, a nightshade wreath to thee,
Whose Muse a sure though late revenge hath ta'en
Of harmless Abel's death by murdering Cain.⁵

On Cain a Mystery dedicated to Sir Walter Scott

A German Haggis— from Receipt
Of him who cook'd "The death of Abel"
And sent "warm-reeking rich" & sweet
From Venice to Sir Walter's table.⁶

After reading a luscious scene of the above—

The Wonder explained
What! Adam's eldest Son in this sweet strain!
Yes— did you never hear of Sugar-Cain?⁷

On a Nursery piece of the same, by a Scottish Bard—

Dont wake little Enoch,
Or he'll give you a wee knock!

⁴Before "opportunity" Wordsworth first wrote, then deleted, "sake." Opposite "Turn over" he struck out "for the Sisters." By "The Girls" he probably meant Southey's daughter Edith (b. 1801) and his niece Sara Coleridge (b. 1802), who made her home with him. For other examples of Wordsworth's abbreviating "Southey" to "S" in a salutation see Ernest de Selincourt, ed., *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth: The Later Years*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1939), I, 343, and II, 649 and 757.

⁵Instead of "right" Wordsworth first wrote "like." This quatrain and the next were first published by William Knight in his *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth*, 8 vols. (London, 1896), VIII, 271-2. Knight remarked: "I have found this in a catalogue of Autograph Letters, and have no knowledge of its date, or of the Bard referred to." Apparently he had not seen the letter itself, for he did not include it in his *Letters of the Wordsworth Family*, 3 vols. (London, 1907).

⁶Wordsworth altered "cooked" to "cook'd." Byron says in his preface to *Cain*: "Gesner's 'Death of Abel' I have never read since I was eight years of age, at Aberdeen." De Selincourt identified the phrase "warm-reeking rich" as a quotation from Burns's *To a Haggis*. See *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth*, edited by E. de Selincourt and Helen Darbishire, 5 vols. (Oxford, 1940-49), IV, 378 and 476.

⁷"After reading" was first "On reading." Knight did not publish either this couplet or the stanza following, and so far as I know they have not been printed before.

For the pretty sweet Lad
 As he lies in his Cradle
 Is more like to his Dad
 Than a Spoon to a Ladle.⁸

Southey evidently heeded the Wordsworths' counsel when he framed his letter to the *Courier*, for he ignored Byron's taunt about his politics and concentrated on rebutting the charge of slander. His advisers no doubt took a keen interest, therefore, in the outcome of their suggestion. Six weeks or so after his disclaimer appeared, Wordsworth's sister-in-law, Sara Hutchinson, voiced an eagerness probably felt by the whole family when she wrote from Rydal Mount to a cousin:

I hope you have seen Southey's tickling Letter to Lord Byron—We long to hear of an answer from his lordship, as S. will then let loose upon him a full sail & if he does not bear him down I shall wonder.⁹

In her loyal enthusiasm Sara could not know how ironically her prophecy would be fulfilled by the broadside which Byron delivered the following October in *The Vision of Judgment*.

Oberlin College

CHESTER L. SHAVER

On Some Manuscripts of La Fontaine in America

Concerning "Tircis et Amarante" (VIII, 13), Regnier has noted: "Walckenaer, dans une note inédite, nous apprend qu'il en a eu entre les mains un manuscrit appartenant à M. Feuillet de Conches et daté du 11 décembre 1674. Nous ne pouvons rien dire de l'authenticité du manuscrit, que nous n'avons pas vu, mais cette date de la composition ne manque pas de vraisemblance. . . ."¹ What appears to be the manuscript that Walckenaer had seen is now in the William A. Clarke Library of the University of California, Los Angeles, bound into a copy of the 1668 edition of the *Fables*.

The fable is written in a clear hand on both sides of two sheets

⁸ See *Cain*, Act III, Scene 1. After "more like to" Wordsworth struck out a word which looks like "kick."

⁹ Kathleen Coburn, ed., *The Letters of Sara Hutchinson* (Toronto, 1954), p. 237.

¹ *Œuvres de J. de La Fontaine*, ed. H. Regnier (Paris: Hachette, 1884), II, 273, notes i-iii.

உறுதிப்படுத்தப்பட்டது

framed
out his
r. His
come of
peared,
gerness
Mount

long to
a full
ly her
ivered

VER

ica
oted:
entre
date
icité
com-
s to
n A.
und

out
(54),
(34),

VOL. LXXV, June 1960

491

L'Ane chargé portant des reliques.

*Un Baudet chargé de Reliques
S'imagina qu'on l'adoroit:
Tant se penser il se quarroit,
Recevant comme saint l'encens et les cantiques.
quelqu'un vid l'erreur et luy dit:
maistre baudet, ottez vous de l'esprit
une vanité si folle;
Ce n'est pas vous, c'est l'Idole
A qui c'est honneur se rend,
Et que la gloire en est dueë.
D'un Magistrat ignorant
C'est la robe qu'on lalueë.
Z*

"L'Ane portant des reliques." J. P. Morgan Library, N. Y.

measuring $7\frac{1}{2}$ x 6 inches each, signed "De La Fontaine" and dated "11 Décembre 1674." It contains no significant variants and only one *rature*. In spelling and punctuation it differs somewhat from the two 1678 texts. In particular, there is no exclamation mark in line 32, which seems to make a better reading, despite Regnier's argument in favor of it.

Concerning the omission of *de* after *près* in line 45 of all printed editions including his own, Regnier asked: "Est-ce une faute d'impression et faut-il lire 'près d'un rivage'?" Our manuscript's single variant provides an affirmative answer to his query, for the line in question reads: "se mire-t-on près d'un rivage."

My first reaction was to accept this manuscript as authentic. After all, Walckenaer had seen it, and since he was frequently called upon to authenticate La Fontaine autographs (I have seen two, each

On ne sçait pas pourquoy, cependant on soupire:
On a peur de le voir, encor qu'on le desir.

Amarante dit à l'instant:

Oh, oh! c'est là ce mal que vous me preschez tant!
Il ne m'est pas nouveau: je pense le connaître.

Tircis à son tour croioit estre
quand la belle ajouta: Voilà ~~parmi~~ tout justement
Ce que je sent pour Clidamant.
L'autre pensa mourir de deuil et de honte.

Il est force gent comme eux
qui prétendent n'agir que pour leur propre conte
Et qui font le marché d'autrui.

De la fontaine

ce 11 Decembre 1674.

S

"Tircis et Amarante" f. 4. W. A. Clarke Library, Los Angeles.

bearing a note in his hand certifying it as genuine) he would conceivably have expressed any doubts he might have had in his note to Regnier. But with regard to La Fontaine manuscripts, scholars have tended to show considerable circumspection, which may well be a result of Regnier's cautionary note: "il est aujourd'hui reconnu que la plupart des pièces volantes, répandues en si grand nombre sous le nom de La Fontaine, surtout celles qui sont signées, ne sont pas de sa main, mais de la main de copistes ou de celle de faussaires."² No authority is given for this opinion. La Fontaine's most recent biographer, Monica Sutherland, agreeing with the nineteenth-century editor, adds that forgery was prevalent in the early nineteenth century,

² Ibid., IX, i.

and that Feuillet de Conches himself practiced it!³ Obviously, since the Clarke manuscript had once belonged to his collection, it was imperative to compare its handwriting with whatever authenticated manuscripts or reproductions of manuscripts were available.

Furtunately, there are a number of La Fontaine autographs in America. Fairly recently, Professor Wadsworth published the text and a facsimile of a poem in the J. Pierpont Morgan Library, "Vous qui menez les Gripon . . .," which is the second part of a manuscript containing the *Relation de l'Entrée de la Reine*.⁴ His chief reasons for believing this to be genuine were 1) its close correspondence with accepted La Fontaine autographs dating from that period and 2) extensive revisions and corrections in the text which could only have been made by the author. Wadsworth had compared his find with the *Voyage en Limousin* letters (1663) in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, and the *Epigramme* to Fouquet, reproduced by A. C. M. Robert.⁵

In addition to the *Relation de l'Entrée*, the Morgan possesses some La Fontaine manuscripts not mentioned by Wadsworth. There are eleven separate pieces in all, and among these five *Contes*: "La Clochette," "Conte tiré d'Athénée," "Autre Conte tiré d'Athénée," "Historiette," and "Conte du juge de Mesle"; five fables: "La Montagne qui accouche," "La Poule aux œufs d'or," "L'Asne portant des reliques," "Les Compagnons d'Ulysse," "Le Philosophe scythe"; and the ballade "Sur la naissance du Duc de Bourgogne." The Houghton Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts, has the manuscripts of the two madrigals addressed to Mlle Collette and a receipt, to my knowledge unpublished.⁶

³ Monica Sutherland, *La Fontaine* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1953), p. 183. Mrs. Sutherland states, p. 184, that a letter from Feuillet des Conches on the subject of La Fontaine mss. can be seen at the Bibliothèque Nationale. However an exhaustive search at that library has failed to turn up any such letter. The Department of Manuscripts there has some correspondence of his dealing with mss. but none referring to La Fontaine.

⁴ "An Unpublished Manuscript by La Fontaine," *PMLA*, LXVI (December, 1951), 1183-1188.

⁵ A. C. M. Robert, *Fables inédites des 12^e, 13^e, et 14^e siècles et fables de La Fontaine* . . . (Paris, 1852), I, iii.

⁶ The call numbers for the Morgan mss. are MA 835, MA 220 and MA 221. The Houghton poems are in the Lowell Autographs and the receipt, which I reprint here with the permission of the Houghton Library, is in the F. Locker autographs: "J'ay receu de Nicolas Deschamps, marchand, ayant la retrocession de l'adiudication faite à feu Jean du Lin des quarante arpens de vente ordinaire en la forest de barbillon pour user en la presente année mil six cens soixante la somme de cent cinquante livres scavoir six vingt livres en l'acquit de Charles des Champs son frere adiudicaire de quatre milliers de fagots

La Fontaine's handwriting, while neat and regular, differs in certain ways from any seventeenth-century hand I have seen. In the eleven Morgan manuscripts the writing is somewhat larger than that of the *Relation de l'Entrée*, but shares with it a number of unique characteristics. Of the small letters the most striking are *e*, which La Fontaine forms in two ways, either as a loop, in the usual manner, or in two downward strokes, rarely closed; *p*, which is formed with one upward and one downward stroke and has a distinctive curled tail; *q*, which has a firm, almost completely vertical downward stroke; and *s*, which rises fully above the line in a high loop. The most distinctive capital letters are *A*, *M*, *D*, and *E*.

The poet very frequently uses the "fermesse," or crossed *S*, resembling a dollar sign, either following his signature when he signed business documents, to separate the stanzas in a poem, or to conclude it. In the Clarke manuscript there is a "fermesse" below the date; in the Morgan and Houghton manuscripts one concludes each poem; a "fermesse" separates each of the Gripon stanzas.

All the manuscripts I have studied reveal these features, as do the various reproductions I have seen, among them the fragment of *Achille* in the *Album* of the Grands Ecrivains edition, "Le Renard et les Mouches," also reproduced by Robert, and a number of facsimiles in booksellers' catalogues. The variations in size, and, very infrequently, in the formation of letters, can be attributed to a natural process of evolution during the poet's life. It should also be noted that the most obviously authentic specimens—letters and receipts—would naturally be written with less care than the poems he copied out, for circulation or presentation.

To Mrs. Sutherland should go the credit for having made the first study of La Fontaine's handwriting, although she has perhaps not gone far enough. She has noted some of the characteristics mentioned above, and examined some, though apparently not all, of the Morgan

suivant l'exploit de vente cy dessus et trente livres en argent contant lesquels cent cinquante livres je promets lui faire tenir compte sur le prix principal de l'adiudication des d. quarante arpens par ceux qui sont preposés à la recoepte du d. prix comme ayant receu les d. cent cinquante livres pour l'acquit d'un reste de gages qui m'estoit deu es années mil six cens cinquante sept et mil six cens cinquante huit promettant de luy faire valider et alouer le d. receu de cent cinquante livres et m'ont esté payez les trente livres en deniers contans pour eviter les frais de plus grandes poursuites et avoir main levée du reste de la marchandise saisie à ma requeste de laquelle je donne aud. des champs main levée et consens que le commissaire en soit deschargé moyennant les sud. cent cinquante livres que j'ay receus. fait ce quinziesme aoust mil six cens soixante. De la fontaine."

manuscripts, two of which, "Les Compagnons d'Ulysse," and "Le Philosophe scythe," she appears to consider genuine. In judging these, one of her criteria seems questionable, for she suggests that length is an assurance of authenticity: "A forger would choose one of the shorter fables. The sustained forging of so long a fable as 'Les Compagnons d'Ulysse' would indeed be a work of art."⁷ Mrs. Sutherland does not mention the other fables, the ballade, or the *contes* at the Morgan, and declares "no manuscript of a *conte* appears to exist," which leads me to believe she had seen only part of the collection.

There is an additional point to consider. Regnier's warning (echoed by Mrs. Sutherland) that most of the manuscripts in circulation are the work of copyists or forgers needs clarification. It is well known that contemporary copies were made for circulation before printing; La Fontaine himself occasionally made more than one.⁸ But to what purpose would a contemporary of the poet imitate his handwriting? One can assume, I believe, that actual forging began in the nineteenth century, when the autograph trade had begun to flourish: as Feuillet de Conches himself wrote in 1849, "les autographes sont une branche de commerce florissante."⁹ One might further assume that the nineteenth-century forger would copy from a printed text once he had learned to imitate the poet's hand, so that it would be unlikely that manuscripts containing variants would be forgeries. Now the Clarke manuscript, as we have seen, contains one variant, as do three of the poems at the Morgan. The manuscript version of the *conte* which appears in all editions as "Conte de xxx" corresponds exactly to that printed in *Les Plaisirs de la poésie galante, gaillarde et amoureuse* prior to the 1665 edition. The title is "Historiette" and the name "Claude" appears throughout instead of "Jeanne." Another *conte* in the collection, "La Clochette," has one interesting revision in line 34. The author has crossed out "quinze" and written in above "treize," reducing his heroine's age by two years. And the title of the "Conte du juge de Mesle" has in parentheses

⁷ Op. cit., p. 184.

⁸ Cf. the facsimile of "Le Lièvre et la Tortue," reprinted in *L'Autographe*, 1865, which has the following note by La Fontaine: "J'ay retrouvé une ancienne copie du Lievre, elle est telle que je la vais donner à l'imprimeur. Je vous l'envoie puisque vous ne la connoissez point."

⁹ Nouvelles acquisitions françaises, 1304, Bibliothèque Nationale. I have seen a photostat of a signed ms. of La Fontaine's letter concerning Mlle Colletet (*Œuvres*, ix, pp. 315-316) now at the Bodleian Library, an obvious copy in which no attempt had been made to imitate La Fontaine's writing.

"petite ville qui appartient à M. le Prince," as in the Conrart manuscript. Of the fables, there is one variant in "La Montagne qui accouche," (line 2: "poussait une clameur") and "Les Campagnons d'Ulysse" contains the six final lines of the 1690 printing in the *Mercur de France* which appear in no subsequent edition. It is worth adding, in view of Regnier's warning note, that both "Le Philosophe scythe" and the ballade are signed.

I am prepared, on the basis of the foregoing, to conclude that the Clarke, Morgan, and Houghton manuscripts are genuine. While I make no claim to *expertise* in calligraphy, I believe the presence of unique characteristics in all of them leaves little room for doubt. Absolute certainty must perhaps await a careful *recensement* of all extant manuscripts and a verification by experts. But at least until then, let us be as cautious in denying authenticity as we have been in granting it.

University of California, Los Angeles

JOHN C. LAPP

Charles Nodier and the Marquis de Sade

Much has been written concerning the supposed meeting of Charles Nodier with the Marquis de Sade in Sainte-Pélagie prison. The novelist, Simone de Beauvoir, in probing for an image of the divine Marquis in her penetrating study *Must We Burn Sade?*, cites a letter he wrote from the Bastille complaining that lack of exercise has made him so fat that he can hardly move about. She then continues,

C'est cette corpulence qui frappa d'abord Charles Nodier quand il croisa Sade, en 1807, à Sainte-Pélagie: "Une obésité énorme qui gênait assez ses mouvements pour l'empêcher de déployer un reste de grâce et d'élégance dont on retrouvait des traces dans l'ensemble de ses manières. Ses yeux fatigués conservaient cependant je ne sais quoi de brillant et de févreux qui s'y ranimait de temps à autre, comme une étincelle expirante sur un charbon éteint."¹

She in turn cites Jean Desbordes, *Le Vrai Visage du Marquis de Sade*, in which Nodier's description of the Marquis is likened to the portrait of the aging Oscar Wilde.²

¹ Simone de Beauvoir, "Faut-il brûler Sade?", *Les Temps Modernes*, 74 (December, 1951), 1004.

² Jean Desbordes, *Le Vrai Visage du Marquis de Sade* (Paris, 1939), p. 14.

More recently the brilliant and enthusiastic but somewhat rhapsodic biographer of Sade, Gilbert Lely, reaffirms the authenticity of Nodier's portrait of de Sade, but changes the date of meeting to March 14, 1803, the day Sade was being transferred from Sainte-Pélagie to Bicêtre prison. After citing the portrait quoted above by Simone de Beauvoir he adds,

Il n'existe aucune raison de mettre en doute—ainsi que l'a fait certain biographe dont la circonspection en matière de document aurait eu cent fois l'occasion de s'exercer à meilleur titre—l'authenticité d'un tel portrait, qui correspond à ce que Sade a écrit lui-même de sa corpulence et à ce que révèlent de la finesse de son visage les signalements administratifs. Et comment ne serait pas perçue dans le texte de Nodier cette irisation frissonnante qui est le spectre du réel? *

I have no way of knowing how Mlle de Beauvoir arrived at the year 1807 for the date of meeting between Sade and Nodier. According to Lely, Sade was transferred from Bicêtre to Charenton April 15, 1803 and remained there until his death in 1814.⁴ In that same year, 1807, Nodier on the other hand had not seen Paris for at least three years, having been banished to Besançon in January, 1804. He was not to return to Paris until September, 1809, when he obtained special permission to pass through the capital on his way to his new position as secretary to Sir Herbert Croft in Amiens. In 1807 he had not yet succeeded in having the surveillance of his person transferred from Besançon to Dole.⁵ So we cannot seriously entertain 1807 as a possible meeting date of these two authors.

Lely's fixing of the date at March 14, 1803 in Sainte-Pélagie is more plausible, but this too misses the possible *rencontre* by almost a year; moreover, as we shall see, Nodier claimed he had met Sade in the Temple prison and not at Sainte-Pélagie, and that the notorious Marquis was being transferred to Charenton and not Bicêtre. We know now beyond the shadow of a doubt that Nodier was arrested at his own bidding as the author of the libellous *La Napoléone* on December 20, 1803. After a brief interrogation at Sainte-Pélagie he was sent to La Force to be treated for a venereal disease. Thirty-

* Gilbert Lely, *Vie du Marquis de Sade* (Paris: Gallimard, 1957), II, 582.

⁴ Lely, *op. cit.*, II, 583.

⁵ For Nodier's banishment from Paris see, Archives Nationales, F⁷6457, dossier 9740, folios 13-18. For permission to spend 24 hours in Paris on his way to Amiens, September 7, 1809, folios 46-7. Nodier went secretly to Dole in 1807 but did not obtain permission to reside there until April 11, 1808, *vide* folios 28-35.

seven days later he was remanded to the custody of his father and the surveillance of the liberal prefect of the Doubs department, Jean De Bry. The release order, dated January 26, 1804, was given at La Force.⁶ So Nodier only passed through Sainte-Pélagie on his way to La Force. We have the entire minutes of the interrogation and order of immediate transfer; Nodier was not allowed to see anyone at Sainte-Pélagie except Inspector Dubois and his assistants. He was then hustled off to the clinic at La Force. Thus the famous meeting between Sade and Nodier could not have taken place in Sainte-Pélagie on March 14, 1803, as Lely claims, since shortly after that date we have a letter from Nodier's lifelong friend, Charles Weiss, to a mutual friend, Charles Pertuisier, informing us that "Nodier travaille toujours et beaucoup" in Besançon.⁷ Nor could the meeting have taken place on December 20, 1803, when Nodier stopped briefly at Sainte-Pélagie on his way to La Force because by then Sade had been cooling his heels at Charenton for nine months. Nodier was never incarcerated at Sainte-Pélagie, and since there is no record of his ever having been arrested before or after this date in Paris we can discount his stay at the Temple prison as well. So the meeting between Nodier and Sade was a fiction which took place only in the vivid imagination of the romantic writer. Sade, for his part, never mentions Nodier's name.

How did this myth get started? Soon after the Restoration, Nodier was busy weaving a legend of anti-Napoleonic activity which would endear him to the restored Bourbons. This activity had the disadvantage of alienating the sympathies of his former friends, notably Jean De Bry, Jouy, Etienne and Arnault. In consequence he was hard put to it later in marshalling enough votes among the liberals to obtain a seat in the Academy.⁸ But that could not be helped for the present and the opportunist Nodier was willing to sacrifice a few facts to draw the protection of the new monarchy. Subsequently, much of his writing in the press and in the periodicals of the day must be viewed in this light if we are to understand Nodier's defense of a Catholic, legitimate romanticism. The prescription called for a

⁶ Archives Nationales, F⁷6457, dossier 9740, folios 3-14. He was arrested 30 frimaire, he had been in Paris since 10 brumaire (November 1), and released 7 pluviôse, an XII.

⁷ Letter of 4 germinal, an XI (March 25, 1803), published by L. Pingaud in *La Jeunesse de Charles Nodier* (Paris: Champion, 1919), p. 251.

⁸ See A. R. Oliver, *Nodier's Criticism of the Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française*, *MLJ*, xli (January, 1957), 21.

mingling of fact and fiction which did not go unchallenged in all quarters; but the famous Nodier charm in spell-binding his audience convinced even those who were in a position to know better. As time went on the inimitable story-teller began to believe in his own legend of persecution and martyrdom at the hands of the Napoleonic regime. Soon he grew bold enough to publish his fabrications as *Souvenirs et portraits de la Révolution française*, first serially in the *Revue de Paris*, 1829, then in book form as *Souvenirs, épisodes et portraits pour servir à l'histoire de la Révolution et de l'Empire*, Paris 1831, 2 volumes,⁹ later collected in his works, volume VIII, as *Souvenirs et portraits*, 1833. The *Souvenir* we are concerned with here is entitled *Les Prisons de Paris, sous le Consulat. I. Le Dépôt de la Préfecture et du Temple*. It appeared for the first time in the *Revue de Paris*, 1829, Volume II, pp. 215-233. Here is the passage referring to his meeting with Sade,

Enfin, . . . nous arrivâmes au Temple. On m'écroua dans le bureau de M. Fauconnier; on me conduisit à une petite chambre carrée, garnie de quatre couches assez propres, dont trois étaient occupées; et je goûtai avec un ravissement qui ne retarda pas de longtemps mon sommeil, la fraîcheur d'un gros linge blanc, et la souplesse voluptueuse d'un oreiller de paille.

Le lendemain, il fit un peu plus jour à mes yeux qu'à la salle de dépôt. Des commencements de démolition déblayaient de tous côtés nos tourelles; et nous avions de l'air et de la lumière à nous quatre pour vingt prisonniers de la Préfecture. Un de ces messieurs se leva de très bonne heure, parce qu'il allait être transféré, et qu'il en était prévenu. Je ne remarquai d'abord en lui qu'une obésité énorme, qui gênait assez ses mouvements pour l'empêcher de déployer un reste de grâce et d'éloquence dont on retrouvait des traces dans l'ensemble de ses manières et de son langage. Ses yeux fatigués conservaient cependant je ne sais quoi de brillant et de fin qui s'y ranimait de temps à autre comme une étincelle expirante sur un charbon éteint. Ce n'était pas un conspirateur; et personne ne pouvait l'accuser d'avoir pris part aux affaires politiques. Comme ses attaques ne s'étaient jamais adressées qu'à deux puissances sociales d'une assez grande importance, mais dont la stabilité entraînait pour fort peu de chose dans les instructions secrètes de la police, c'est-à-dire la religion et la morale, l'autorité venait de lui faire une grande part d'indulgence. Il était envoyé au bord des belles eaux de Charenton, relégué sous ses riches ombrages; et il s'évada quand il voulut. Nous apprîmes, quelques mois plus tard, en prison, que M. de Sade s'était sauvé.¹⁰

The last sentence places the seal of fiction on these memoirs: Nodier

⁹ M. Lely, op. cit., II, 582, note 1, misquotes this title as *Souvenirs de la Restauration et de l'Empire*.

¹⁰ I am citing from Nodier's *Œuvres*, VIII, 166-7.

was never in prison more than thirty-seven days. It must also be noticed in passing that Nodier remains very vague as to dates throughout all these *Souvenirs*; he had learned from the discomfort he experienced when in recounting his memoirs orally, he was trapped by those whose memories were more precise than his own. He would become extremely irritable when a listener would not let him "dream out loud," even if that listener was his life long friend Charles Weiss.¹¹ Nodier took refuge in the dream because reality was too ugly; in this case, besides the need to gloss over the rather compromising political stand he assumed at the Restoration mentioned above, there was the seamy reality of the venereal disease contracted in furtive promiscuity with one of the bawds of the Palais Royal gardens that was too ignoble for the hero of *La Napoléone*.

In the light of the foregoing remarks concerning Nodier's youthful sexual indiscretions, the remainder of the quotation concerning de Sade takes on special significance,

Je n'ai point d'idée nette de ce qu'il a écrit. J'ai aperçu ces livres-là; je les ai retournés plutôt que feuilletés, pour voir de droite à gauche si le crime filtrait partout. J'ai conservé de ces monstrueuses turpitudes une impression vague d'étonnement et d'horreur; mais il y a une grande question de droit politique à placer à côté de ce grand intérêt de la société, si cruellement outragé dans un ouvrage dont le titre même est devenu obscène. Ce de Sade est le prototype des victimes *extra* judiciaires de la haute justice du consulat et de l'empire. On ne sut comment soumettre aux tribunaux, et à leurs formes politiques, et à leurs débats spectaculaires, un délit qui offensait tellement la pudeur morale de la société toute entière, qu'on pouvait à peine le caractériser sans danger; et il est vrai de dire que les matériaux de cette hideuse procédure étaient plus repoussants à explorer que le haillon sanglant et le lambeau de chair meurtrie qui décèlent un assassinat. Ce fut un corps non judiciaire, le conseil d'état, je crois, qui prononça contre l'accusé la détention perpétuelle; et l'arbitraire ne manqua pas d'occasions pour se fonder, comme on dirait aujourd'hui, sur ce *précédent* arbitraire. Je n'examine pas le fond de la question. Il y a des cas de publicité où la publicité est peut-être plus funeste que l'attentat; mais il faudrait alors un Code réservé pour des cas réservés; il faudrait que la loi eût ses grands pénitenciers comme l'église. Parmi les images de Némésis que les anciens nous ont laissées, il y en a une qui porte un voile: autrement il est aisé de comprendre comment cette usurpation du droit de juger, tout exceptionnelle qu'on ait voulu la faire, tombe de degré en degré aux derniers agents des derniers pouvoirs; et remarquez que lorsqu'un de ces attentats a été commis deux ou trois fois, il change tout à coup de nom. Il s'appelle *jurisprudence*. Les sociétés ne périssent que par des abus légitimes.

¹¹ See Pingaud, op. cit., pp. 213-14.

J'ai dit que ce prisonnier ne fit que passer sous mes yeux. Je me souviens seulement qu'il était poli jusqu'à l'obséquiosité, affable jusqu'à l'onction, et qu'il parlait respectueusement de tout ce que l'on respecte.¹²

One is tempted to hazard that in an effort to minimize his own irregularities in the Palais Royal gardens, Nodier felt it necessary to whitewash to a degree de Sade's notorious reputation as a pervert and amoralist. The plea for more tolerant and understanding legislation with regard to cases of this nature, however, we must take more seriously: Nodier was one of the first to oppose capital punishment, he was one of the earliest articulate feminists, and in general he begged for a more humane legal system to be administered by understanding and sympathetic judges.

Over forty years ago a wise compatriot of Nodier, Pierre Philibert, writing under the pseudonym of Léonce Pingaud, shrewdly guessed that *Les Souvenirs de la Révolution* "... relèvent plutôt de la littérature que de l'histoire," and questioned Nodier's meeting with the Marquis de Sade.¹³ With the resurgence in Nodier interest in the forties and fifties, scholars have tended to overlook this perceptive and thoroughly reliable biographer of the young Franc-Comtois. Perhaps it is time to renew acquaintance with this avid student whose study, *La Jeunesse de Charles Nodier*, is still the best biography on the subject.

Washington and Jefferson College

A. RICHARD OLIVER

Two Poems on Death by Juan Ramón Jiménez

A striking feature of the poetry of Juan Ramón Jiménez is the relationship it stresses between life and death. Life is an *aprendizaje* for death; sleep is part of the learning. Life and death are concentric circles, their respective paths guided by the *conciencia amadora*.¹ The usual feeling of anguish in confrontation with death is

¹² Nodier, *Oeuvres*, VIII, 167-9.

¹³ Pingaud, op. cit., pp. 186 and 196 respectively.

¹ The general outlines of this relationship have been intelligently surveyed by Rafael Santos Torroella, "La muerte, norma vocativa en la poesía de J. R. J.," *La Torre*, v (1957), 323-340. Professor Fogelquist in his admirable study, "JRJ: Vida y obra," *RHM*, xxiv (1958), 120-121, writes, "En 1952, ya restablecido de una enfermedad que había durado dos años y medio,

markedly absent in Jiménez' work. Only occasionally does he yield to what might be called normal human feelings in the face of death:

Muerte, ¡si tu enterrarnos
no fuese abismo duro y seco,
sino suave hondura,
profundidad inmensa!
¡Si fueras, muerte,
como un negro subterráneo;
si no importara, en ti, que el sol cayera
porque la noche fuese bella y clara! (p. 48)²

The close, complementary relationship between life and death can be judged from many poems, especially those appearing in *Poesía* and *Belleza*, works of middle age, and in *Animal de fondo*, a late book. In this paper I have chosen two poems which I consider especially outstanding in their presentation of this theme. By analyzing their content and style, I wish to show how Jiménez insisted on his theme, how he handled it, and how his great technical care aided in its presentation.

The following poem, often overlooked in critical discussions, is an extended conceit. It carries no title.

Lazo que atas, fuerte, mi vida con la vida,
¡ata mi vida, cuando sea
—sin aflojarte nada—,
de pronto, fuerte, con la muerte!
¡No vayas deshaciéndote,
desligando mi vida de la vida
—abriendo una tristeza de acabar,
que habrá de ser tristeza de empezar—;
no pongas entre nudo y nudo,
desierto y tedio,
tedio y desierto;
no dejes vana, vacilante, un punto,
mi vida plena, con la entera muerte!
¡Lazo, vida, apretado hasta el final,
apretado desde el principio, muerte! (p. 88)

Here is a brilliant and subtle presentation of Jiménez' entire concept that life and death form equally the reality which defines man-

escribió Juan Ramón que la vida y la muerte siempre habían estado unidos en él, luchando una con otra. . . ."

²The poems under consideration are quoted from *Poesía (en verso)* (1917-1923) (Buenos Aires, 1957).

kind. On one level, he seems to be saying that he does not wish to die gradually over a long period of time, but that suddenly, when the moment arrives, the *lazo* which links his life to all of life should join itself unflinchingly to death. Do not, he pleads, undo me bit by bit, loosening my life from life itself, do not leave my *vida plena* vacillating with *entera muerte*. In other words, do not fear or anticipate; accept quickly, when the time comes.

However, given an extensive knowledge of Jiménez' poetry, this reading is not sufficient. For one who found, as did T. S. Eliot, that "In my beginning is my end," it is not simply a question of facing up squarely to the final moment; rather, one exploits the knowledge of inevitability in order to gain a deeper understanding of life.

The relationship symbolized by the *lazo* is not merely between two points. The rope joins life to life as well as life to death. The relationship is more like a taut ellipse, as may be seen in the last two lines. These *hendecasilabos*, with three instances of synalepha in the first one (tightening slack, as it were), clearly state that life and death are the same thing. *Vida* is related with *final*, and *principio* with *muerte*. *Apretado* is twice repeated, for Jiménez insists in both the first and last stanzas that the *lazo* must be taut (*fuerte*). A taut line between life and death, beginning and end, allows no time for boredom, the fearful ennui (*desierto y tedio*). Even more significantly it prevents the listing away from life which a loose line allows. Without the constant tug of death, life is not lived to its fullest. Life and death are pulled closer together in order that the human situation may be more fully realized.

Jiménez has reinforced his theme with many subtle techniques of style and construction.³ Key words are carefully placed. *Muerte* and its synonyms *acabar* and *final* always appear at the end of their lines. *Desierto y tedio* repeated in opposite order have the effect of underlining the tediousness of a life which does not accept death. *Lazo*, the vital link, begins the first and last stanza.

Such a closely reasoned poem ought to have an equally tight structure. A glance at the versification, ranging from thirteen syllables to five, seems to be the opposite of *apretado*. But tautness in the structure may be discovered. Tension—enough to maintain tautness—

³ One must preface any analysis of Juan Ramón's style with the remark made by Pedro Henríquez Ureña that from the very beginning nothing in the poet's work was a product of chance. Prologue to *Poesías* (Mexico, 1923), p. 10.

is engendered by the fact that the entire poem is constructed upon a set of apparent opposites: *vida-muerte*, *acabar-empezar*, *fuerte-vacilante*, *vida plena-entera muerte*, *final-principio*. They are, of course, not opposites as Jiménez conceives them, but they are antagonistic to the first glance. Their elliptical placement performs the task of the *lazo*, holding them tightly together. The effect is further heightened by repeating words like sharp tugs on a rope: *vida*, seven times; *muerte*, three; and twice each *tristeza*, *lazo*, *nudo*, *desierto*, *tedio*, *atar*, *apretado*, *fuerte*. Five times out of seven, *vida* also receives the internal accent necessary to the line.⁴ *Lazo* appears twice in the vocative and is accented each time. *Muerte* is accented both times and is also always the final word in its line. Stress is maintained twice on *fuerte*, a key word, and by a difficult maneuver.⁵ The other repeated words receive the *acento constitutivo* at least once.

These effects, each one limited in itself, act together to haul in slack on an otherwise loose construction. While some of them may be unpremeditated, their general result cannot have been unknown to the poet, who was from the very beginning a consummate craftsman.

Treating the same theme, the following poem, which is better known than the first one,⁶ depends for its effect on tone and vocabulary rather than subtle structural techniques.

¿Cómo, muerte, tenerte
miedo? ¿No estás aquí conmigo, trabajando?
¿No te toco en mis ojos; no me dices
que no sabes de nada, que eres hueca,
inconsciente y pacífica? ¿No gozas,
conmigo, todo: gloria, soledad,
amor, hasta tus tuétanos?
¿No me estás aguantando,
muerte, de pie, la vida?
¿No te traigo y te llevo, ciega,
como tu lazarillo? ¿No repites
con tu boca pasiva
lo que quiero que digas? ¿No soportas,

⁴The *hendecasilabo* in line thirteen must be scanned as a Sapphic verse (accents on syllables four, eight, and ten), thus keeping the accent from falling on *vida*. In line fourteen I count the stressed syllables as one, six, and ten.

⁵In order to read line one correctly, it should be scanned as a *tridecasilabo compuesto*, made up of a *hexasilabo* and a *heptasilabo*. See Tomás Navarro, *Métrica española* (Syracuse, 1956), p. 433, for examples of such scansion. The line will thus be stressed: "Lázo que atas, fuérte, / mi vida con la vida."

⁶J. M. Cohen includes it in *The Penguin Book of Spanish Verse* (1956), p. 356, and Max Aub chooses it for comment in *La poesía española contemporánea* (Mexico, 1954), p. 80.

esclava, la bondad con que te obligo?
 ¿Qué verás, qué dirás, adónde irás
 sin mí? ¿No seré yo,
 muerte, tu muerte, a quien tú, muerte,
 debes temer, mimar, amar? (p. 40)

Instead of presenting the intimate relationship between life and death in the abstract terms of a *lazo*, Jiménez has put it completely on a personal, flesh and blood basis, worthy of his Spanish heritage. It is man's poem; death is translated into his terms, assimilated to him, and, with a note of restrained triumph, made to depend upon him.

If fear is based on the unknown, intimacy is the obvious device to banish it. In this poem, intimacy is attained through physical and affective identification, and an ironic tone belabors fear. The persistent questions, as Torroella has said, are really affirmative.⁷ The vocabulary treats of quite ordinary human actions: *temer miedo, decir, tocar, saber, amar, llevar, traer*. The use of *trabajando* in line two sets a delightfully intimate note. What is more peaceful than to labor side by side? The present participle prolongs the effect.⁸ The poem's third question allows death existence in relation to the poet's most intimate perception: "¿No te toco en mis ojos . . .?" Jiménez then deprecates death: it is hollow, unconscious, and peaceful. Lines five through seven continue the intertwining of man and death, the partner of every human emotion or state, preparing the magnificent irony of "¿No me estás aguantando, / muerte, de pie, la vida?" The phrase *de pie* is Jiménez' way of keeping the question from being too affirmative. Death is not so submissive that it lies down; it resists and endures, *de pie*.⁹

The final two questions rephrase the main theme: that death and life are inseparable. The technical result of the last question is brilliant. The meaning depends on the careful punctuation. The profusion of *r*-sounds in words all set off by commas brings the poem to its peaceful, strong conclusion, the irony abated but still present. The connotation of the final three infinitives keeps the poem rooted

⁷ Op. cit., p. 334.

⁸ Cf. Jorge Manrique's use of the present participle as a *pie quebrado* in the first stanza of the *Coplas*. Cf., also, Antonio Machado's use of this verb in his poem to Giner de los Ríos, "Van tres días / que mi hermano Francisco no trabaja." *Poesías completas* (Madrid, 1956), pp. 173-174.

⁹ Jiménez attached great importance to this phrase and the attitude of firmness it represents. Cf. "¿Dame, de pie, el reposo; / dame el sueño, de pie; / dame, de pie y en paz, la sola idea . . . !" *Poesía*, p. 37.

to mankind. It is, in my opinion, one of the finest endings of any poem in modern Spanish literature.

Through such painstaking care, Jiménez reiterated his idea of the closeness of life and death and of their essential compatibility. Awareness of his idea and its thoughtful presentation deepens our understanding of his poetic work. A line such as the following, which to a casual reader might appear to be mere romantic decadence, assumes a richer meaning after the analysis just concluded: "Corazón da lo mismo: muere o canta."¹⁰

Pomona College

HOWARD T. YOUNG

Heines Kampf gegen die Tradition

Den Einzelnen und seine Gefühls- und Erfahrungswelt als eine in sich geschlossene Einheit darzustellen, wie es in Goethes *Faust* in einem letzten strahlenden Aufblühen vor dem Erlöschen einer jahrhundertelangen Entwicklung und Tradition geschehen war, war manchen der um 1800 geborenen Dichter nicht mehr möglich. Ein Stendhal, ein Balzac und auch ein Heine gehörten zu der ersten Generation einer neuen Epoche und waren oder wurden sich dessen durchaus bewusst, so wie 600 Jahre vor ihnen Boccaccio und Petrarca. Das beginnende Zeitalter des Industrialismus und der Technik, der Massenorganisationen und Massensiedlungen brachte nebst einer Reihe anderer Umwälzungen eine Änderung im Verhältnis des Einzelnen zur Umwelt mit sich,—eine Änderung, auf der das heute vielgehörte Schlagwort vom Ende des Individualismus im 20. Jahrhundert beruht. Die der neuen Zeit, dem 19. Jahrhundert zugehörigen Dichter mussten neue Formen finden, und um sie zu finden, mussten sie von der Tradition abrücken.

Wie Stendhal und Balzac war auch Heine anfänglich der Romantik verbunden, wie sie entfernte er sich mit der Zeit von ihr und betrachtete sie später—ob mit Recht oder Unrecht sei dahingestellt—im wesentlichen als Auswuchs und Überspitzung einer vorwiegend dem Gefühls—und Innenleben zugewandten künstlerischen Tradition. Allein so tief hatte er sich gefühlsmässig, geistig und künstlerisch in die Welt der Romantik versenkt, dass er sich erst nach einem

¹⁰ *Antología poética* (Buenos Aires, 1944), p. 283.

langen, bitteren und bisher ganz ungenügend gewürdigten Ringen um 1826 von ihr zu lösen begann. Die geistige Tradition, die zu ihr geführt hatte, beschäftigte ihn so stark, dass er sich mit ihr noch in der ersten Hälfte der dreissiger Jahre in der *Romantischen Schule* und *Zur Geschichte der Religion und Philosophie in Deutschland* auseinandersetzte.

Wäre Heines Kampf gegen die Tradition lediglich ein persönliches Problem gewesen,—von der Art etwa wie Kleists Erschütterung durch Kant oder E. T. A. Hoffmanns Ringen mit einer halluzinatorischen Phantasie oder Goethes Bedürfnis nach einem inneren Ausgleich oder Thomas Manns Suche nach Themen—(das hatte er übrigens auch) so wäre sein Fall zwar interessant, aber doch vor allem in Bezug auf ihn selbst, als Darstellung von Heinrich Heines Wesen, Wollen und Tun. Sein Kampf mit der Tradition aber und sein Bemühen um eine neue Ästhetik ist als Zeitproblem weit über seine Person hinaus aufschlussreich—und als Zeitproblem betrachtete er selbst es, wie wir sehen werden.

Von zwei Männern wurde Heine in jungen Jahren beeinflusst, von A. W. Schlegel und von Hegel. Von Schlegel wurde er, als er 1820 in Bonn studierte, ihm Gedichte zur Begutachtung vorlegte und eine Art poetischer Hausaufgaben—vor allem Sonette und Übersetzungen aus dem Englischen—für ihn schrieb, dahingehend belehrt, dass der Dichter ein Prophet sei, der in die Vergangenheit blicke. Die Dichtung der Vergangenheit sei zu studieren, meinte Schlegel, und insbesondere das Volkslied. Obwohl Heine damals der Lieddichtung mit Leib und Seele verschrieben war, versuchte er doch schon sehr bald, zuerst um 1821, die Schranken des Volks- und Liebesliedes zu durchbrechen, und zwar mittels der Stimmungsbrechung, die fälschlich als eine typisch Heinesche Erscheinung angesehen und mit seinen privaten Erlebnissen in Verbindung gebracht wurde. Die Stimmungsbrechung war eine Zeiterscheinung, sie lag sozusagen in der Luft. Auch bei Arnim und selbst bei Brentano tritt sie auf, wie schon Günther Müller betonte,¹ und aus demselben Grunde wie bei Heine: als Ausdruck einer, allerdings noch unklaren, Opposition gegen ein damals weitverbreitetes Lebensgefühl. Bei Heine findet sie sich häufiger als bei anderen Dichtern, denn er kämpfte besonders hartnäckig um eine Einbeziehung der Wirklichkeit, des äusseren Lebens, in die Dichtung. Keinesfalls darf die Stimmungsbrechung der romantischen Ironie gleichgestellt werden. Die romantische Ironie wandte sich gegen die

¹ *Geschichte des deutschen Liedes* (München, 1926), S. 280.

Wirklichkeit, die Stimmungsbrechung gegen die Abkehr von der Wirklichkeit. Heine sagte viel später, die Stimmungsbrechung sei "mit entschiedenem Bewusstsein gegen die weichliche Gefühlsseligkeit der Schwaben"² entstanden. Er musste aber erkennen, und das geschah um die Mitte der zwanziger Jahre, dass es unmöglich ist, gegen eine Tradition zu kämpfen, wenn man selbst auf dem Boden neben dieser Tradition steht und dichtet. Nach einigem Zögern und schweren Herzens zog er die einzig fruchtbare Schlussfolgerung und wandte sich gegen Ende der zwanziger Jahre von der Lieddichtung ab.³

Kurze Zeit nachdem er bei Schlegel gehört hatte, kam er nach Berlin, besuchte 1823 Hegels Vorlesungen und lernte ihn kennen. Hegels Ästhetik bestärkte ihn in der bisher nur unklar gefühlten Opposition, denn Hegel sprach aus, wonach Heine und andere seiner Generation suchten. Der für sie wesentlichste Punkt der Hegelschen Ästhetik lautete: "Nach Innen und Aussen muss er (der Dichter) das menschliche Dasein kennen, und die Breite der Welt und ihrer Erscheinungen in sein Inneres hineingenommen und dort durchfühlt, durchdrungen, vertieft und verklärt haben."⁴ Wenn Heine später meinte, Schlegel sei 1827 bei seinen Berliner Vorlesungen vom Publikum, das inzwischen Hegels Ästhetik kennengelernt hätte, "achselzuckend verspottet"⁵ worden, so erinnerte er sich wohl ebenso sehr seines eigenen Eindrucks wie der allgemeinen Reaktion.

1831 formulierte Heine seine Überlegungen über Kunst und Literatur. Als erstes fragte er nach dem Verhältnis des Künstlers zu seiner Zeit. Jede Zeit, so meinte er, gebäre ihre eigene Kunst und habe ihre eigenen Symbole. "Meine alte Prophezeiung von dem Ende der Kunstperiode, die bei Goethes Wiege anfang und bei seinem Sarge aufhörte, scheint ihrer Erfüllung nahe zu sein. Die jetzige Kunst muss zu Grunde gehen, weil ihr Prinzip noch im abgelebten, alten Regime, in der heiligen römischen Reichsvergangenheit wurzelt. Dieser Widerspruch und nicht die Zeitbewegung selbst ist der Kunst so schädlich."⁶ Denn durch diesen Widerspruch komme es in dem

² Houben, *Gespräche mit Heine* (Frankfurt, 1926), S. 745.

³ Vgl. Hirth, I, 395; und auch I, 392—"Ich werde immer zur rechten Zeit aufhören zu wissen, wenn ich in einer Gattung nichts Besseres als das schon Geleistete geben kann." Ähnliches sagte er im Vorwort von 1831 zu *Nordsee III*. Ernst Elsters Tabellen zufolge schrieb Heine zwischen 1830 und 39 rund 75 Gedichte, während vor 1830 rund 360 entstanden. Und nicht zufällig veröffentlichte Heine zwischen 1827 und 1844 keinen neuen Gedichtband.

⁴ Hegel, *Werke* (Berlin, 1843), 3, 272-3.

⁵ Elster, *Heines Sämtl. Werke*, v, 280; vgl. auch v, 274.

⁶ Elster, iv, 72.

Künstler, der an seiner Zeit nicht Anteil nimmt, zu einem Gefühl der Isolierung und als Folge der Isolierung oder jedenfalls doch verbunden mit ihr zu Schmerzgefühlen und Todessehnsucht—heute würden wir wohl mit Holthusen von “Angst- und Nichtserlebnissen” sprechen. In diesem Falle sei dann die Kunst ganz auf den Künstler bezogen, der vom Tagesleben getrennt arbeite. Dass die Zeit selbst den Künstler zu solcher Trennung zwingt, liess Heine nicht gelten. Denn welcher Art die Zeit ist, hielt er für unwesentlich. Die Geschichte zeigt, sagte er, dass weder Kriegsnot noch Revolution, weder Parteistürme noch andere Unruhen der Kunst und dem Künstler schaden. Er wies auf Florenz und Athen hin, die in den unruhigsten und wildesten Zeiten die grössten Künstler und die herrlichsten Kunstwerke hervorgebracht hatten, eben weil die Künstler mitten in ihrer Zeit standen und die Zeitprobleme behandelten. Dante habe, als er in Verbannung und Not die *Göttliche Komödie* schrieb, nicht über das eigene Leid, das Exil, geklagt, sondern über den Untergang der Freiheit. Äschylos habe in den *Persern* das allgemeine Schicksal, nicht seine Privatleiden, geschildert—“ihre Werke waren das träumende Spiegelbild ihrer Zeit.”⁷ Heine forderte die Nähe zur Zeit, das Eingehen auf ihre Probleme um der Kunst willen, als Voraussetzung des die Zeit überdauernden, daher gültigen Kunstwerkes und durchaus nicht, wie oft behauptet wurde, im Namen einer besseren Welt, einer Partei oder einer Religion. Im Gegenteil, er lehnte es immer ab, die Kunst ausser künstlerischen Interessen dienstbar zu machen. So stellte er sich schärfstens gegen die saintsimonistische Forderung, dass die Kunst der Beglückung der Menschheit und der Verschönerung des Lebens dienen solle.⁸ Sich und seine Zeitgenossen sah Heine an der Schwelle einer neuen Zeit, daher auch an der Schwelle einer neuen Kunst: “Indessen, die neue Zeit wird auch eine neue Kunst gebären, die mit ihr selbst in begeistertem Einklang sein wird. . . .”⁹ Allein das war Zukunftsmusik, noch war die neue Zeit nicht gekommen—was tun? Seine Lösung war einfach wie das Ei des Columbus, und prachtvoll unlogisch. Er wandte sich von theoretischen Überlegungen, die ohnedies nicht seine Stärke waren, ab und ging auf sich selbst, auf die eigene Kraft, zurück: “Bis dahin möge, mit Farben und Klängen, die selbsttrunkenste Subjektivität, die gottfreie Persönlichkeit, die weltentzügelte Individualität sich geltend machen, was doch immer erspriesslicher ist als das tote Scheinwesen der alten Kunst.”¹⁰ Die Ablehnung der alten Kunst wie, um

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Vgl. Elster, iv, 524 f.

⁹ Elster, iv, 73.

¹⁰ Ibid.

seinen grossartigen Ausdruck zu gebrauchen, die "weltentzügelte Individualität" führten ihn notgedrungen der Zukunft entgegen; wer nicht zurück geht, schreitet vorwärts. 1854 konnte er schreiben: "Mit mir ist die alte lyrische Schule der Deutschen abgeschlossen, während zugleich die neue Schule, die moderne deutsche Lyrik von mir eröffnet ward."¹¹ Dass zwischen ungefähr 1826 und 1839 die "alte" und die "neue" Kunst in seiner Dichtung nahe beieinander standen, die eine in abfallender, die andere in aufsteigender Linie, hat viel dazu beigetragen, Heines Bild so oszillierend erscheinen zu lassen.

Dass die Kunst der neuen Zeit entsprechen müsse, war leichter gesagt als getan. Die Prosa freilich erwies sich als relativ wandlungsfähig, besonders wenn man sich zum Wandel zwingen wollte, wie Stendhal z. B., der jeden Morgen den *Côte Napoléon* als stilistische Pflichtlektüre las und sich erst zum Schreibtisch setzte, wenn er glaubte, ein Gegengewicht gegen Chateaubriandsche Gefühlsaufwallungen gefunden zu haben. Wenn es nicht leicht war für Prosaschriftsteller, um wieviel schwerer war es erst für Lyriker. Denn die Lyrik ist die konservativste poetische Gattung, und sie wendet sich an das Konservativste in uns, an unser Gefühl und unsere Assoziationen. Sie widerstrebt am hartnäckigsten Änderungen und Neuerungen. Je deutlicher Heine sein Zeitalter als eine Zeit der Industrie und Finanz erkannte, desto unpöetischer, ja antipöetischer erschien ihm in Augenblicken der Entmutigung sein Jahrhundert, und in den dreissiger Jahren, noch bevor er einen Zugang zur Lyrik, wie er sie wollte, gefunden hatte, fragte er sich und seine Freunde, ob Lyrik in solcher Zeit überhaupt noch möglich sei¹² eine Frage, die man auch heute recht häufig hört. Trotz seiner Zweifel versuchte er aber immer wieder, eine neue lyrische Aussageweise zu finden. Lyrik, oder Poesie, wie er es nannte, war ihm eine Lebensnotwendigkeit, und er konnte ihr nicht auf immer entsagen. Anfang der vierziger Jahre fand er endlich die Aussageweise, nach der er suchte. Inzwischen hatte sich auch eine entscheidende Wandlung in seinem Lebensgefühl vollzogen; er hatte den Weltschmerz der Jugendjahre abgeschüttelt, seine Einstellung war jetzt lebensbejahend—"Aber der Tod ist nicht pöetischer als das Leben"¹³ heisst es in der *Romantischen Schule*. Von der

¹¹ Elster, VI, 19.

¹² Vgl. Hirth, II, 322 (11. Okt. 1839) "Mein Lebensalter, und vielleicht unsere ganze Zeit, ist (in) den Versen nicht mehr günstig und verlangt Prosa."

¹³ Elster, v, 274.

Bindung an die Vergangenheit war er über eine Identifizierung mit der Gegenwart zu einer in sich gefestigten Beobachterstellung vorge-
gerückt. Und Kunst sah er jetzt nicht mehr wie früher als eine
Krankheitserscheinung an, dem Zustandekommen von Perlen ver-
gleichbar;¹⁴ sie war ihm, wie er in "Jehuda ben Halevy," einem
sehr späten Gedicht, sagte, "heitres Wissen, holdes Können," geschaffen
von einer "schönen Menschenseele."¹⁵

Um 1840 wandte Heine sich vom Natur- und Liebesgedicht, das
in Deutschland noch gerade eine Monopolstellung erlangt hatte, ab,
und über "Atta Troll" und "Deutschland ein Wintermärchen" wie
über politische und soziale Zeitgedichte stiess er zu einer Reihe zeit-
loser Themen vor, in denen Natur und Liebe auch eine Rolle, aber
nicht mehr die Hauptrolle spielen. Das Wesen des Sieges, das Wesen
der Niederlage vermittelte er jetzt, Sklavenhandel und Glanz und
Elend einer Kurtisane, die Schicksale einer Reihe von Königen, die
von Dichtern, die Sehnsucht nach ewiger Jugend, den Tanz ums
goldene Kalb, den Siegesrausch der Jugend, das Jüngste Gericht und
die ersten Schultage—die Liste liesse sich lange fortsetzen. Diese
Themen erforderten ein neues Vokabular—er hatte es sich in den
dreissiger Jahren erarbeitet. Von dem um 1836 geschriebenen Gedicht
"An Jenny" sagte er, es sei ein Versuch gewesen, Namen und Daten
ins Gedicht einzuführen;¹⁶ und er war stolz auf die für unlyrisch
geltenden Worte, die er im Tannhäusergedicht verwendet hatte.

Aber thematische Neuerungen sind, wie wir aus der Kunst- und
Literaturgeschichte wissen, selten von entscheidender Bedeutung und
oft nur Übergangserscheinungen. Weitaus wichtiger und bedeutungs-
voller als die Neuerungen vom Thema her ist in Heines späten Ge-
dichten eine weniger ins Auge springende, eine sehr subtile und doch
aus keinem wegzudenkende Wandlung. Es kam zu einem neuen
Verhältnis zwischen Dichter und Stimmung. Nicht mehr das Gefühl

¹⁴ Ibid., 302.

¹⁵ "Jehuda ben Halevy," Elster, I, 442 und 454; vgl. auch Schöpfungslied 7:
Den Übergang von der "inneren Krankheit" zur Gesundheit:

Krankheit ist wohl der letzte Grund
Des ganzen Schöpferdrangs gewesen;
Erschaffend konnte ich genesen,
Erschaffend wurde ich gesund.

¹⁶ Vergl. Hirth, II, 104-5: "Das Gedicht jedoch, welches anfängt: "Ich bin
nun dreiunddreissig Jahre alt, und du bist fünfzehnjährig kaum," können Sie
immerhin abdrucken, aber ich bitte Sie, meinen Namen *nicht* darunter zu
setzen; die Natürlichkeit ist hier bis zur Karikatur gesteigert, das fühl ich;
es war ein Versuch, Jahreszahlen und Datum im Gedicht einzuführen."

oder, um mit Heidegger zu sprechen, die "Gestimmtheit" des Dichters herrscht vor. In diesen Gedichten wird die Stimmung vom Thema bestimmt, d. h. der Gefühls- und Stimmungswert, den der Dichter in dem jeweils behandelten Stoff immanent sieht, wird wiedergegeben. Der Kürze halber sei nur auf die Königsgedichte des "Romanzero" hingewiesen. Jeweils jene Atmosphäre, jene Stimmung wird in ihnen hervorgerufen, die, von Heine aus gesehen, bezeichnend für das Thema ist. In "König Richard" ist die Stimmung froh beschwingt und heiter, während "König David" beklemmend grausam und kalt wirkt. In "Karl I" mischt sich kindlich naive Unschuld mit einer resignierten Stimmung, mit dem Gefühl einer unabwendbaren Bedrohung. "Marie Antoinette" wiederum belustigt mit einer Mischung von halb frivoler, halb gespenstischer Nichtigkeit. Des Dichters ursprünglich eigenes Gefühl ist in diesen Gedichten da wie eh und je, aber es steht nicht mehr im Mittelpunkt, es bestimmt die Perspektive, von der aus ein Thema gesehen, erlebt wird. Das setzt natürlich gewisse Kenntnisse und eine gefestigte Weltanschauung voraus. Die Verschiebung im Schaffen einer Stimmung, die sich stilistisch auch in der Tonalität auswirkt, bringt ausserdem mitunter—da nämlich, wo das Thema es verlangt,—ein Ende der Stimmungseinheit mit sich, also ein Ende dessen, was besonders von der Romantik axiomatisch zum Wesen der Lyrik selbst erhoben worden war. E. A. Poe hat das Axiom wohl am besten formuliert.¹⁷

Das wichtigste Resultat von Heines Kampf gegen die Tradition und das revolutionär Neue in seiner späten Dichtung ist demnach der Wechsel in der Bewertung von Stimmung und Gefühl und ihre Zuordnung zum Thema, wobei dem Dichter die Wahl der Perspektive, von der aus ein Thema gesehen und dargestellt wird, vorbehalten bleibt. Die individuelle Gefühls- und Stimmungswelt besteht jetzt nur noch als ein Element unter anderen fort und hat viel von ihrem früheren Glanz verloren. So weit wie Hemingway, dem Gefühle überhaupt unbehaglich zu sein scheinen und der sie mit "toughness" zu verdecken sucht, oder wie Bert Brecht in der Verfremdungstechnik ging Heine nicht. Ob eben dies ihn einmal als für unser Zeitalter

¹⁷ Poes Gedankengang in "The Philosophy of Composition" und "The Poetic Principle" ist wie folgt: Ein Gedicht soll die Seele erschüttern oder erheben; das kann es nur, wenn es von grosser Intensität ist; grosse Intensität setzt die Konzentrierung auf eine einzige Stimmung voraus (bei Poe Trauer und Todesahnung als die schönste); eine intensive Stimmung kann nur von kurzer Dauer sein. Endfolgerung (mit der Poe charakteristischerweise beginnt): nur kurze Gedichte sind wahrhaft Gedichte.

repräsentativ erscheinen lassen oder ob eben dies ihm die Rolle eines Vorläufers zuweisen wird, kann sich erst erweisen, wenn die Entwicklung, die zu Heines Zeit begann und heute noch andauert, weiter fortgeschritten sein wird.

University of Toronto

LAURA HOFRICHTER

REVIEWS

Thomas B. Stroup, ed., *The Selected Poems of George Daniel of Beswick 1616-1657* (Lexington: Univ. of Kentucky Press, 1959. xxix + 201 pp. \$5.50). UNLIKE their Elizabethan predecessors, most poets of the early seventeenth century did not find London conducive to poetry. Even before the theatres closed and the Civil War gave the capital wholly to the Puritans, London seems to have lost its attraction for men of letters. Instead, the quiet of Dean Prior or of Horton was necessary to entertain the Muse. There was a withdrawal from London, a diaspora into the countryside. Literature had begun to secede from life.

This is the tradition which George Daniel represents:

He shun Court Care, and the proud Cities Strife,
Center my Joyes, in a poore Countrie Life.
("A Pastorall Ode," ll. 71-72)

At his estate in Yorkshire, Daniel read and painted, hunted and fished—and wrote poems. From such a man who willfully eschewed the ferment of the seventeenth century, we might expect effete and derivative poesy; and that, with very few exceptions, is precisely what we have. A self-avowed son of Ben, Daniel assiduously imitated Horace. He followed the precepts of the master, reproduced his poetry in the vernacular, and emulated his English disciple, Jonson.

Daniel's extant literary output resides in BM Additional Ms. 19,255, which A. B. Grosart edited in 1878. Since this edition is unreliable and scarce (only 100 copies), Professor Stroup offers a new volume to secure for Daniel a place in literary history. He has reprinted here only short poems, since the longer works—*Trinarchodia*, *Vervicensis*, *The Genius of This Great and Glorious Isle*, and *Ecclesiasticus*—are not only bulky but inferior poetically. Indeed, they are no great loss.

Nor are the short poems a great rediscovery. They offer shallow comments on many ancient and modern poets, they record a contemporary response to Thomas Browne's *Religio Medici* and *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*, and some of the natural description is pleasing. But Daniel himself penned what might well be the epitaph for his mediocrity in talent and his superficiality in thought:

I am all dullnes; I was Shap't
Only to flutter, in the lower Shrubbs
Of Earth-borne-follies.

("An Ode Upon . . . *The Temple*," ll. 7-9)

So much for the intrinsic value of a man more passionate toward a pipe than a paramour (see "To Nicotiana"), of a man who rated Shakespeare below both Jonson and Beaumont (see "A Vindication of Poesie").

Nonetheless, we should be grateful to Professor Stroup for calling these poems to our attention. They interestingly reflect the fading brilliance of Jonson and Donne, and they give some faint promise of Dryden and Pope, especially in the dextrous use of heroic couplets. We should likewise be grateful for the concise introduction which traces Daniel's family history (respectable, but hardly notable), conjures up a personality, and describes briefly the longer poems not printed here.

Duke University

S. K. HENINGER, JR.

R. C. Bald, *Donne and the Drurys* (New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1959. x + 176 pp. \$5.50). IN 1624 Lady Anne Drury, the relict of Sir Robert Drury, died and was buried in the chancel of Hawstead Church, Suffolk. By the terms of her will her brother, Sir Edmund Bacon, was appointed executor of the estate and residuary legatee; and by that chance two leather boxes containing deeds, inventories, indentures, and other matters pertaining to the affairs of the Drurys were transferred to the "Evidence-chamber" at Redgrave Hall and deposited among documents of the Bacon family. They remained there for three centuries, and in that time about half of them were lost or destroyed, among them "24 old Letters sowed together of Mr. Jo. Donne." Those that survived were purchased by the University of Chicago in 1924 along with the rest of the Red-

grave muniments. In 1953 they were discovered by Professor Bald and eventually became the basis of this book.

Professor Bald's primary purpose is to present the more important of these new documents in full, others in selection or summary. In addition, he has supplemented them with material from other sources, and so reworked them into a narrative. The result is a history of the Drury family with special reference to the last of the line, Sir Robert Drury, the patron of John Donne. Since almost all the surviving documents concern legal and/or business negotiations, they tell us very little about the Drurys as people with lives apart from their contracts and deeds. Professor Bald does what he can, but the material remains intractable; and as it turns out, the fundamental concern of the book is not the Drurys, but what the Drurys possessed, since that is the primary and almost exclusive concern of the documents themselves. Arranged by Professor Bald, they describe the rise and steady progress of a fortune, its eventual embroilment in debt, its careful extraction, and its final dispersal after the deaths of the childless Sir Robert Drury and his widow, Anne.

Despite its immediate aims, the ultimate purpose of the book is literary. The Drurys and their documents are important only in so far as they supply new information about John Donne and, in particular, about the main artistic result of his association with the Drurys, the two *Anniversaries* he wrote on the occasion of the death of their daughter Elizabeth. One of the more important of Professor Bald's discoveries is that a certain William Lyly, a respected dependent of Sir Robert Drury's, was also John Donne's brother-in-law, the second husband of his sister Anne. Although Professor Bald generally stops short of conclusions, it seems reasonable to assume that this relationship gave Donne a way to meet the Drurys. At least it makes it possible that he did not introduce himself, as is usually believed, by tentatively extending a short poem entitled *A Funerall Elegie* and then, when that seemed successful, a full-scale enlargement which eventually swelled to two *Anniversaries*. It further suggests that the *Funerall Elegie* is probably not the germ from which the entire sequence grew, for if it was not designed by Donne as a simultaneous calling card and professional sample, there is no need for it to have been written before *The First Anniversary*, and we are free to read it after, if we want. That is the way Donne arranged the poems to be read in the 1611 edition, which he undoubtedly saw through the press himself, and it is the only way the poems make sense: the

Funerall Elegie recapitulates the primary image of *The First Anniversary*, the death of the world in her death, which is dependent upon the symbolic process of the *Anniversary* for its meaning.

Professor Bald also furnishes the important information that Sir Robert Drury was not the richest man in England, nor even one of the richest, as Edmund Gosse led us to believe. He also tells us that Donne was not rewarded for the *Anniversaries* with a rent-free apartment in the town house at Drury Lane, but that he lived independently in a separate establishment on the property and probably paid rent for it like everyone else. All these are isolated, largely negative fragments, of course, but taken together they alter somewhat the usual myth of Donne's career as a parasite. Although he was naturally drawn closer to Sir Robert Drury as a result of the *Anniversaries*, he was never a servile dependent flattering the memory of his patron's daughter to secure a roof over his head. And the important thing about that is that it removes some of the suspicions we have about the poems, some of the obstacles to our eventual comprehension of them as they are in themselves.

Yale University

FRANK MANLEY

Joseph E. Duncan, *The Revival of Metaphysical Poetry; the History of a Style, 1800 to the Present* (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1959. 227 pp. \$4.50). MR. Duncan's title indicates something of the difficulty of his aims. He attempts to give an account of the critical reputations of certain seventeenth-century poets from 1800 to the present and to evaluate those poets' influence on the poetry of the same period. He seems to think, moreover, that "metaphysical poetry" is a distinguishable kind of poetry, that it was revived in the nineteenth century and continues to exist, changing but continuous: "This work may be best thought of as the history of a style—or as the history of a particular kind of idea and attitude." It is a formidable task.

There has never been general agreement on what "metaphysical poetry" is or who the "metaphysical poets" were. Mr. Duncan's individual list of the seventeenth-century worthies includes Donne, the Herberts, Aurelian Townshend, King, Cleveland, Marvell, and Cowley. ("Richard Crashaw was a metaphysical poet, but he was a

special case. In the work of Henry Vaughan and Thomas Traherne there are some important metaphysical elements, but other qualities are so pronounced that it is deceptive to consider these poets with Donne.") Each critic makes his own list. Mr. Duncan notes that in the modern period there has been "a growing tendency to regard as 'metaphysical' as much good poetry as possible," and that Milton, Butler, Bunyan, Pope, Gray, Burns, Wordsworth, Shelley, Swinburne, and Whitman have been included among the "metaphysicals"—he might have added many Elizabethans and most of the seventeenth-century poets. He even admits that "a diligent search would probably turn up something metaphysical in a majority of modern poets." He goes on, however, in the body of his book to make his own canon: Hood, Beddoes, Browning, Emerson, Thoreau, Hopkins, Dickinson, Francis Thompson, Alice Meynell, Gosse, Arthur Symons, Rupert Brooke, Yeats, Eliot, Wallace Stevens, Ransom, Tate, R. P. Warren, Elinor Wylie, Herbert Read, Edith Sitwell, Empson—all, and some others, are "metaphysicals." Might other terms do almost as well? Might we call them all "romantics"? or "post-romantics"? or "transcendentalists"? or simply "poets since the early nineteenth century"? Mr. Duncan is not alone. The terminology of modern criticism seems to have lost its cutting edge. If one is to agree with Mr. Duncan, however, that any poet who resembles the seventeenth-century poets in the slightest in using various "devices" ("paradox," "irony," "ambiguity," "conceits," "correspondences," "analogies between the physical and the supersensible world," "psychology," "thought-feeling relationships," "mathematical images," etc.), then his list seems strangely arbitrary: if Francis Thompson, why not James Thomson? if Browning, why not Meredith? if Alice Meynell, why not Coventry Patmore? What about Emily Brontë? What should we do with Josephine Miles' demonstration that Cummings is nearer to Donne in grammatical usage than is Eliot? But the game is endless.

Mr. Duncan has read a great deal, and the sections of his study which deal with the reputations of the seventeenth-century poets are the most convincing. Much of his chapter on "The Metaphysical Revival: 1872-1912" forms a valuable addition to A. N. Nethercot's work on the "reputations." His treatment of "influences" is, almost inevitably, less sure: one reader's poetic influence is another reader's poetic commonplace. But the chapters on "John Donne and Robert Browning" and on "Eliot and the Twentieth-Century Revival" con-

tain both fresh information and significant insights. (Some notice of F. W. Bateson's and Frank Kermode's investigations of "unified sensibility" would have strengthened the Eliot chapter.)

Throughout the book one finds imprecise and awkward language and some strange judgments. "Many of Browning's metaphors, like the most characteristically metaphysical figures of Donne, are logical, extended, organic, deanimizing, dynamic, spatial, and conceptual." One wonders what the Herberts and Marvell and many of the others would have made of the notion that "the metaphysical style was allied with a Catholic and Anglo-Catholic point of view." Most disturbing of all is the suggestion that attacks on the "new critics" are implicitly attacks on "metaphysical poetry," "since they tend to undermine the reputations of its champions and the interpretations of the poetry that have proved most meaningful to the twentieth century." If he disagreed with Norman Vincent Peale, one gathers, Reinhold Niebuhr would "attack" Christianity by undermining the reputation of one of its "champions."

One also finds epigrammatic formulations which are delightful: "While Herbert was satisfied with a star, Thompson wanted a sky-rocket." "In Donne the structural complexity is logical; in Eliot it is psychological." "The twentieth century discovered that Donne was a modern and then that moderns needed to be more like Donne." Mr. Duncan, like most of us, seems happiest when he can give his attention to the poems, poets, and issues he likes and understands best, undistracted by the nebulous ghost of "metaphysical poetry."

Washington University, St. Louis

JOSEPH H. SUMMERS

Alvar Ellegard, *Darwin and the General Reader. The Reception of Darwin's Theory of Evolution in the British Periodical Press, 1859-1872* (Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag, 1958. 394 pp. Gothenburg Studies in English, 8. Also publ. as *Acta Universitatis Gothenburgensis*, 64). THIS book is the most intensive and comprehensive study of the impact of Darwin's writings on contemporary opinion in a single country which has yet been published. Of 115 British newspapers and periodicals examined by Professor Ellegard in the period from 1859 to 1872, 107 contained some expression of opinion on the issues raised by Darwin. Ellegard estimates the aggre-

gate circulation of the review organs, newspapers, magazines and weekly journals examined in this study at between two and three million copies per issue, a substantial part of the total material published in Great Britain in Darwin's day. These publications are classified according to their journalistic character, political and religious affiliation, and the educational level of their readers. Every reference to any part of Darwin's theory in each of these publications has been graded according to the amount and depth of information in it. By this means Ellegard is able to score publications and groups of publications and to construct tables and graphs showing correlations between these scores and political, religious, and educational viewpoints.

What conclusions emerge from this impressive array of tables and graphs? In general, Ellegard finds that the idea of evolution in the non-human part of the organic world had made substantial gains among the general public as early as 1863; by 1870 it was generally accepted among the educated classes and was gaining ground among the less well educated. In the latter group the theory of man's descent from animals was resisted to the end of the period (1872). Among "highbrow" readers it had made considerable headway by that time, but Darwin's theory of natural selection was still generally rejected in favor of some kind of predetermined or supernaturally directed evolution. Although the idea of natural selection was the "scientifically significant" part of Darwin's theory of evolution, it was discussed "very scrappily," more in terms of its theological implications than of its scientific adequacy.

Ellegard goes on to establish correlations between attitudes toward Darwin and the political, religious, and educational outlook of the groups who held these attitudes. On the whole, the correlations which emerge are those which one would expect. Low educational standard correlates with greater opposition to Darwinian doctrines, high educational standard with a more favorable attitude. Political liberals and radicals were more hospitable to Darwinism than political conservatives. In the Christian community Unitarians and Broad Church groups were most favorable to Darwin; High Church adherents and Roman Catholics took a middle position; evangelical Non-Conformists resisted Darwinism strenuously. Surprisingly enough, however, magazines emphasizing science and natural history were slower than some of the general periodicals to swing around in favor of evolution.

The arguments for and against Darwin are examined in a series

of interesting chapters on "Science and Religion," "The Argument of Design," "Miracles," "The Bible," "Mid-Victorian Philosophy of Science," and the like. Ellegard's analysis is extensive, well-organized, and illuminating, though sometimes lacking in historical perspective. He discerns three levels of conflict between science and religion in the Victorian period. The first concerned the historical accuracy of the Bible and traditional beliefs concerning the inspiration of Scripture. The second involved the doctrine of creation and the argument from design. The third concerned the growing claim of science to constitute the sole reliable method of acquiring knowledge of reality. Ellegard's discussion of these levels of conflict is perceptive and informative, but certain questions may profitably be raised concerning his interpretation at each level.

As to the first level, that of Biblical infallibility, it seems unlikely that literal acceptance of the narrative in Genesis was as general in Darwin's day as Ellegard suggests. In the United States, better known to the present reviewer than Britain, evangelically-minded scientists had gone a long way toward remaking the Scriptural cosmogony in accordance with the findings of geology by means of a non-literal interpretation of the six days of creation, and there was a significant minority who had gone over to a positivistic and naturalistic gospel of secular progress in the manner of Comte and Spencer. Curiously enough, Spencer is scarcely mentioned in Professor Ellegard's book, nor is there much discussion of British freethinkers. The issue concerning the inspiration of Scripture had been thrashed out vigorously in the eighteenth century, and deism was still very much alive in the early nineteenth century, though somewhat submerged by the evangelical revival. Ellegard's selective concentration on press opinion concerning Darwin's theory has had the effect of making Darwin appear to be the chief cause of developments which had acquired momentum independently of Darwin's contribution to their further progress. Ellegard recognizes the influence of the "higher criticism" on attitudes toward the Bible, but he underestimates the combined effect of the expansion of scientific knowledge in astronomy, anthropology, archaeology, geology, and paleontology on received opinions before Darwin's time. It may be true that the Darwinian controversy was the catalyst which precipitated a general rethinking of traditional doctrines of Scriptural inspiration, but the ground for this development had been prepared well in advance.

The shock to Christian faith conveyed by the gradual discovery of

the scientific inadequacy of Scripture was indeed staggering. But if, as Professor Ellegard argues, religious dogmas symbolize deeply felt intuitions concerning values and the ultimate nature of things, the discovery of the mythological character of some of the Biblical narratives should not prove fatal to Christianity if the Christian view of human nature is grounded in reality. In that case, Professor Ellegard's lament for the decay of Biblical Christianity may prove to have been premature. In the twentieth century there has been a decided return to the Bible among theologians, though not to the conception of Biblical inspiration which prevailed in Darwin's time.

In general, however, Darwin's challenge to revealed religion was less novel and damaging than his challenge to natural theology, which had leaned heavily on the argument for God's existence and attributes from the wise contrivance of the structures of nature. Ellegard makes this point crystal clear. He shows how Darwin shook natural theology to its foundations by making random variation and struggle for existence the architects of organic change and adaptation. The general idea of organic evolution could be assimilated to the argument from design by the simple expedient of letting the Creator establish the laws of organic development, but the method of species formation portrayed in Darwin's theory of natural selection seemed too harsh, wasteful, and blundering to be regarded as the *modus operandi* of a wise and benevolent God. Darwin himself oscillated between admiration for the outcome of the process and dismay at its brutal inefficiency.

Here again, Ellegard's analysis is good so far as it goes, but it tends toward distortion from lack of historical perspective. The static view of nature asserted the stability as well as the wise design of the structures of nature. Stability, wise contrivance, perfect balance and harmony, the subordination of the lower forms of existence to the higher—all of these ideas had played a part in the static version of the doctrine of creation, and all of them had been badly shaken by developments in astronomy, geology, paleontology, and biology before Darwin delivered the *coup de grace* with his theory of natural selection. It seems a little unfair to accuse Darwin's predecessors of being "unscientific" in their view of the origin of species. In their view, science was not concerned with the origin of nature's structures. This was assumed to be a theological question. The scientist's job was to discover and to describe the systems of nature, their harmonious arrangement, their adaptation of means to ends, their usefulness to man. Final causes were part of the scientist's

legitimate concern. This conception of science no longer prevails; it gradually disintegrated as a dynamic view of nature replaced the static view. But it was not "unscientific" in any absolute sense. It was simply a different view of science, and it may well be that the conception of science in terms of which Ellegard condemns the pre-Darwinian view of natural history may appear "unscientific" to scientists a hundred years hence.

In discussing the epistemological level of the conflict between science and religion Professor Ellegard reduces the controversy to an issue between pro-Darwinian empiricists and anti-Darwinian idealists. This view of the matter, though interesting and often illuminating, is open to question on several counts.

(1) Although Darwin did much to promote the idea that science can comprehend the whole of human experience, he was not the first to live by this faith. Positivism and the deification of scientific method were older than this. One thinks immediately of Cabanis, Lamarck, Comte, and Spencer.

(2) It is true that empiricists from the time of Locke and Boyle had found it difficult to conceive of a species of things as anything more than a "convention of accidents," but this does not seem to have prevented them from accepting the traditional notion of the fixity of species until Darwin's time. Nor did the gradual acceptance of evolution-by-natural-selection result in the overthrow of idealism and "conceptual realism" in philosophy, though it profoundly affected both. Professor Ellegard's sympathies obviously lie with the empiricists; his account of their views is relatively clear and straightforward. But it is never entirely clear what position or positions he means to describe by such phrases as "idealist-religious," "theological-idealistic view," "conceptual realism," and the like. He seems to have in mind a philosophical catch-all embracing every philosophical school whose epistemology is non-empiricist and whose metaphysic is non-nominalistic. A clearer definition of terms would be helpful to the reader. The implied claim that nominalistic empiricism is the only truly scientific approach to nature seems unwarranted.

(3) Professor Ellegard suggests that the issue between empiricists and idealists went even deeper than epistemology. "The parties disagreed about the fundamental scale of values, symbolized by their different religious beliefs and disbeliefs." What the fundamental scale of values of each side was Ellegard never makes clear. It seems doubtful that the two sides were that far apart. Darwin and Huxley

were good Victorians in their value-attitudes. Ethical relativism may have been implied in Darwin's account of the origin of the moral sense, but Darwin himself was no moral relativist. He recognized the claim of a "higher morality," derived ultimately from Christianity, which taught men to protect and succor the helpless, the weak, and other "unfit" members of society. He believed in progress both in nature and history, but so did most of the anti-Darwinians. More than his opponents, however, Darwin made a religion of science, finding in it his chief source of personal satisfaction and his hope for the future progress of mankind. The religious aspect of Darwinism entirely escapes Ellegard's notice. His "religious world" is made up entirely of Christians, but this is a very arbitrary restriction. It is highly unrealistic to write as if Darwin, Huxley, and their followers were "purely scientific" in their discussion of evolution and natural selection. It is simply not true that they used the terms "higher," "lower," "better," "fittest," and the like in a purely scientific way. They meant to exclude value judgments from their biology, but they did not succeed.

To sum up. This is an excellent book so far as it goes. It is by far the best job of reporting the immediate reaction to Darwin's writings which has yet been done. But the author's sharp focus on a restricted range of materials in a restricted period has the effect of exaggerating Darwin's influence on the development of thought. Ellegard fails to take account of the powerful current of positivistic naturalism which was sweeping through the nineteenth century. At the same time his restricted conception of religion leads him to view the conflict between science and religion too narrowly. Religion was not the exclusive preserve of the Christian denominations. Conversely, Darwinian science was never as purely scientific as Ellegard seems to think. Huxley was as much the prophet of a New Reformation based on faith in scientific method as he was the defender of a biological theory. Professor Ellegard has every right to share that faith if it appeals to him, but he should recognize where science ends and faith begins.

Iowa State University

JOHN C. GREENE

Joseph Rossi and Alfred Galpin, eds., *De Sanctis on Dante* (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1957. xxvi + 164 pp. \$4.00).

THIS translation is designed, obviously, to better the acquaintance of the English-speaking reader with the great Italian pioneer of modern literary criticism that was Francesco De Sanctis. It is hardly intended for the Italian specialist, already familiar with the "new critic" of the nineteenth century, what he reacted against in the study of literature, the particular significance of his own critical work, and its limitations too, his debt to Vico and to Hegel, his influence on Benedetto Croce. All this may not be common knowledge among non-Italian specialists, who until now have perhaps been limited to knowing De Sanctis' fine critical mind only through his classic *History of Italian Literature*, available in English since 1931. Here now, in the midst of the current renaissance of Dante studies in America, is a volume of essays in which one may come to know De Sanctis more intimately, as he focuses on various aspects of Dante's masterpiece.

These seven essays originated as public lectures, given by De Sanctis at Turin, before his appointment, in 1856, to a lectureship in the Federal Polytechnic School of Zurich. The first two, rather general in scope, on "The Subject of the *Divine Comedy*" and "Character of Dante and His Utopia," were to have been the initial chapters of a book on Dante that De Sanctis projected but never finished. Then there are the four well-known interpretative essays on Francesca da Rimini, Farinata, Pier delle Vigne, and Ugolino. The final piece is a review-article based on F. Lamennais' French translation of the *Comedy*. A biographical glossary and an index enhance the usefulness of the volume.

With the translation of these essays there can be no quarrel. It is well done. The translators wisely remained faithful to the original, without attempting to rectify its many stylistic defects and thereby attenuating De Sanctis' peculiar enthusiasm and forcefulness. On the other hand, while they have, in their long introduction, tried to present De Sanctis in such a way as to prepare the modern reader for his characteristic form of rhetoric, which can easily offend particularly the Anglo-Saxon reader, one wonders whether they have entirely succeeded. More specifically, also, the introduction is marred by an excessive Crocean slant, which leads the editors, in speaking of De Sanctis' failure to resolve the antinomy of form and structure in poetry, to make the questionable claim of Croce's "brilliant superamento" in his *Poesia di Dante*. It may not be amiss, therefore, to

mention the critical portrait of De Sanctis by René Wellek that recently appeared in *Italian Quarterly* (I, 1 [1957], pp. 5-43) as an excellent complement to the present volume of essays.

This is not the place to evaluate, or re-evaluate, De Sanctis' work in literary criticism; his originality and importance scarcely require re-affirmation or apology. It may simply be recalled that his method (never crystallized, incidentally, in a formal system) represented a new departure in his day by placing the focus squarely upon the literary artifact, in "aesthetic analyses" or textual *interpretation*. Based on the principle that "the essence of Art is Form," the method recognizes the uniqueness of the individual work of art, and will vary organically according to the particular poem or text under consideration. Moreover, although he was a pioneer, strenuously reacting against the contemporary French, German, and Italian schools of criticism, with their suffocating forms of historical, philosophical, and rhetorical bias, respectively, he did not in turn push his own critical approach to "aesthetic" excesses. De Sanctis, even as militant originator, was able to learn and profit from the other methods, according to their particular *relevance*—a key-word that hovers un-verbalized about his pages. Thus, while doing much to liberate the work of art as such, he did not go to the extreme, not unknown in recent history, of treating it *in vacuo*.

It may be fitting to close with a quotation from the last essay in the present volume, by way of summarizing De Sanctis' critical lesson. Having just taken to task the abuse of historical criticism and also what he calls "the decomposition of the Dantean universe," he pleads for an organic interpretation of the poem:

Here is what, in my opinion, a serious work must do: it must grasp the content of the *Divine Comedy* in its entirety, and analyze it with precision into its constituent elements; it must reject secondary, frivolous, or pedantic questions on which so many volumes have been written; it must determine the essential questions and arrange them in an order that corresponds to the successive moments of the Dantean world; it must expound lucidly such questions as are now to be considered as results achieved beyond dispute, while clarifying and defining the other questions. This serious work has not yet been done . . . [Such work must proceed from] . . . a clear conception of the Dantean unity (pp. 139-140).

With all his limitations and defects—historical inaccuracies, rhetorical style, and Risorgimento axe to grind, De Sanctis pointed the way, and by his example he made an auspicious start in that direction.

Vassar College

ANTHONY L. PELLEGRINI

Ira O. Wade, *The Search for a New Voltaire* (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1958. 206 pp. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, New Series, 48, Part 4. \$5.00).

THE challenging title of this book is unfortunate because, of course, it could not be realized. We are far from knowing all that we would like to know about Voltaire or his work, but it is extremely unlikely—at least in my view—that, after two hundred years of intensive research on the part of both friends and enemies, “a new Voltaire” will ever emerge. The main outlines of his biography and the general tenor of his endeavor will not, I think, be overborne. The Voltaire given us some years ago by Alfred Noyes was indeed a new Voltaire, but it was, to be sure, a false one, based on inadequate knowledge.

The same charge can obviously not be made against Mr. Wade, whose books and articles on Voltaire attest his intimate knowledge of his subject. The purpose of the present volume in the author's words is “to encourage American students . . . to pursue investigations in Voltaire” and “to revive the prestige of American scholarship in eighteenth-century French studies.” The initial incentive to the work—although a different origin is cited on p. 106—was to make available to students a simple inventory of the Delattre and Seymour de Ricci collections on file at the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia.

There is no underlying unity in the book and one is left with the impression of “pièces décousues.” There are four sections called Studies in Biography; Biographia Literaria; From Word to Action; and Towards a New Voltaire. Letters, published and unpublished, appear in quantity with a running commentary—correspondence of Voltaire with Rieu (43 letters); with Manoel de Végobre (nearly two dozen); with Labat de Grandcour (three dozen more or less); with de Caire (50), etc., etc. A selection of titles from parts II and III will perhaps further help to assess the nature of the book: “A Note on *Micromégas*”; “From *Memnon* to *Zadig*”; “A Propos the Sources of an Incident in *Zadig*”; “A Variant to a Verse in the *Épître à M. Marmontel*”; “The First Edition of the *Philosophie ignorant*”; “Notes on *l'Ingénu*”; “The Authorship of the *Commentaire historique*”; “The Genesis of the *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie*.” These may be interesting and scholarly contributions to Voltaire studies but are at best only fringe data, which do not suggest any material change in the outline of the Voltaire edifice. One is, of course, intrigued by the identification of the model who

sat for Cunégonde, but as for baron Thunder-ten-tronckh I feel there was no single original for that magnificent sketch. The notes on *L'Ingénu* are an important adjunct to the critical edition by W. R. Jones, now in its second edition. The list of books Voltaire borrowed from the Royal Library in the thirties and forties is another valuable contribution, reflecting as it does the poet-historian's research. To aid in identifying more of the items in the list let me cite the *Chronicon pretiosum or an account of English money, the price of corn and other commodities for the last 600 years*, by William Fleetwood (London 1707). Then, too, the "Père Desinaters" whose name could not be deciphered is apparently Desmolets who, with abbé Goujet, published the continuation of the *Mémoires de littérature* of A. de Salengre (1726-31). Like Dumas père, it is well known that Voltaire used various people to advance his researches. Mr. Wade quotes letters to show that Christin, the Besançon lawyer, was one of these and that the collaboration between them was continual and close from 1765 on. Professor Watts has also dealt with the Christin data in his more recent article (*French Review*, December 1958). The data on the *Lisbonne* I have treated in another place.¹

The editing of the material and the proofreading leave much to be desired. An impression of undue haste in composition rises from the pages. For example—a letter (p. 25) dated "le 2 mars" is assigned without defense to 1755, although Besterman lists it under 1756. Another letter (p. 26) dated Ferney 26 October is assigned to 1757 but this can not be so as Ferney was acquired much later. In the editing apparently both Beuchot and Moland were used and are cited. The resultant confusion served the author badly, for in one case we find (p. 69) the reference Moland 66:54. The index (of persons only, unfortunately) shows the same haste: Vasserot de Chateaufieux appears both as Vasserot and as Chateaufieux; Marshall Keith is listed separately as Keith (p. 203) and as Baron de Maréchal (p. 204); le comte de Vaux is found not to have a title at all and is listed under Le Compte de Vaux, a family name. Thomas Babington Macaulay appears strangely enough (p. 109 and p. 204) under the capricious spelling, T. B. McCawley! One is reduced to assume that graduate students played a role and that their work was inadequately controlled.

Despite these strictures the book has important data. Not the least

¹ *MLN*, May 1959.

of them are the inventories mentioned above, which make up a sizable part of the book (pp. 115-199). The de Ricci collection bequeathed to the Bibliothèque nationale and now available on microfilm at Philadelphia, together with the 2,000 items in the late Professor Delattre's collection, should be of great service in expanding American research in Voltaire. We are in debt to Professor Wade.

University of California, Los Angeles

FRANCIS J. CROWLEY

Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Œuvres complètes*. Vol. I: *Les Confessions*. *Autres textes autobiographiques* (Paris: Gallimard, 1959. cxviii + 1969 pp. Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, 11). THIS volume marks a memorable date in the history of Rousseau publications. Generations of scholars have resigned themselves, *à contre-cœur*, to using the Lahure-Hachette edition as a common standard of reference, and have longed for an instrument worthier of a great and living writer. They have suffered through its pages, poorly printed on the cheapest of paper, in a presentation that is outdated in its scholarship. While the Moland edition of Voltaire, despite its faults, remains a monument, and even the Assézat-Tourneux edition of Diderot is highly usable, though archaic in many respects; while Montesquieu has been favored by the elegant Masson edition, Rousseau—surely, he would have thought it part of the “plot”!—has been left to the shabby Hachette collection. Knowledge and interpretation of Rousseau have made immense strides in the last century, and we are fortunate in possessing magnificent critical editions of individual works, such as Masson, Havens, Raymond, Mornet, Vaughan and Halbwachs have given us. But the need for a complete *corpus* of the writings, properly edited, properly printed, has been scarcely diminished thereby; in fact, one might argue to the contrary.

True, there have been obstacles. The scope of such a project, its expensiveness, the labor and the knowledge required for its consummation, all called for a collaborative enterprise. The obstacles have now been overcome. The enterprise is going forward under the patronage of the Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau, with a subvention from the Fonds national suisse pour la recherche scientifique and (apparently) from the “Etat de Genève.” Its general editors are the eminent scholars, Bernard Gagnebin and Marcel Raymond. M. Marcel Ray-

mond has informed me that the edition, which will contain the complete writings with the exception of the correspondence (available in the twenty-tome Dufour edition), will comprise five volumes, to be published at the pace of one volume a year. We may assume that the rational structure, by genres, such as has been followed in editions of other eighteenth-century writers, has been selected by the editors in preference to a chronological presentation.

The first instalment, a readable but stout and stubby tome of almost 2,100 pages, in the well-known Pléiade format, perhaps falls somewhat short of the physical presentation one would have preferred; but it is so much better than the Hachette that only an ingrate would complain. United between its leather covers are all of Rousseau's autobiographical writings (that is, intentionally autobiographical): the *Confessions*, *Dialogues*, *Rêveries d'un promeneur solitaire*, all in most reliable and impeccable texts; and a number of "Fragments et Documents autobiographiques," among which are "Mon Portrait," "Ebauches," the "Lettres à Malesherbes," "Comptes," pertinent documents (mémoires, Rousseau's wills), *et alia*. The editorial apparatus includes a detailed chronological table of Rousseau's life, a thorough index of names and of Rousseau's works, and a section of "Notices bibliographiques," giving a history, description and often an evaluation of the various mss. and editions of the works included in the volume. Most important of all are the three Introductions and the section of "Notes et Variantes." The richness of the latter is indicated by the fact that it extends over 650 pages of fine (though clear) type, constituting, therefore, more than one third the length of the volume. It is here that one sees the results of the persistent investigations of which Rousseau has been the object. It would be difficult to give an adequate idea of the wealth of information and explanation, linguistic, biographical, psychological, historical, literary and bibliographical, contained in these pages, which, by themselves, make this edition unique and indispensable.

Lastly, we come to what is first in the book, the Introductions. Gagnebin and Raymond, who edit the *Confessions* and the apparatus pertaining to that work, are the authors of the corresponding introduction. Their principal effort is to trace its origins, and to contribute to our knowledge of the unfolding of Rousseau's autobiographical intentions, and their gradual implementation. In addition to the factual development, they point out a psychological evolution, from Rousseau's proposal to portray all mankind, *à la Montaigne*, through

his self-portrait, to the concept of himself as a unique individual, incarnating the "natural man." The authors also give a summary analysis of Rousseau's psychology, as seen in his self-portrait and his efforts to recapture the past. Here their contribution is to insist that we must search for authenticity not only in the facts, but even more, in the style. "L'acte de peindre, l'acte d'écrire, est en soi révélateur. Il engage l'artiste et l'homme, et par là, les découvre." Admitting, however, that such an ideal is only imperfectly carried out, they proceeded to a stylistic and structural analysis that correlates the work with a musical composition. It should be noted, in passing, that this volume bears the number 11 in the Pléiade series, thus indicating that Louis Martin-Chauffier's edition of the *Confessions* and the *Réveries* (1951), which previously had that number, has been dropped. While the present edition is by far superior, owners of the Martin-Chauffier would be well advised to hold on to it. Not only is the volume more comfortable to read, but the introductory analysis of Rousseau's character, though occasionally too benign, is subtle and worthwhile.

The second introduction, to the *Dialogues*, is the best of the three. Robert Osmont, who has been entrusted with the text and all materials relating to this work, gives us an illuminating study of the "great plot," including the development of the idea and its subjective causes, and its partial basis in facts. The account is objective and well-balanced. But Osmont does more than this. He brings out the strange, hallucinatory character of the *Dialogues*, their combination of logical dialectic and anguish. With a deep understanding of Rousseau's psyche, he lays bare his tormenting need for self-knowledge and self-justification, his search for identity, and the double *procès*, of the outside world against Rousseau, and of Rousseau against himself. Relating Jean-Jacques' personality to his work, Osmont brings out the differences between the *Confessions* and the *Dialogues* in psychological attitudes and in tactics. This is one of the best short pieces on Rousseau that I have read.

In the third introduction, Marcel Raymond, in turn, links the *Réveries* with the *Dialogues*. After studying their chronology, and the domain of reverie, he shows us Rousseau facing in two directions or slopes: "l'un tourné vers l'homme, c'est le versant obscur, l'autre vers la nature, c'est le versant clair." With great finesse, Raymond explores the relation of this work to Rousseau's conflicts, and his progress to self-conquest by enclosure within the circle of his self.

The high quality and the stamp of definitiveness which are the hallmarks of this first volume make it reasonable to predict that this edition, when completed, will replace the Hachette edition as the standard of reference for future scholarly research.

Goucher College

LESTER G. CROCKER

Udo Rukser, *Goethe in der hispanischen Welt* (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1958. 235 pp.). IN contradistinction to similar works of the type "Shakespeare in Italy" or "Dante in England" this book is not boring but fascinating. It is a real comparative history of ideas. It contrasts first the German literature at its highest around 1800 when liberalized Protestantism had developed a romantic idealism, culminating in Goethe, with Spanish literature once flourishing in the *siglo de oro*, but then sunk to its lowest, since a narrow state-church censorship kept everything stimulating out of Spain. Furthermore, whatever reached Spain from Germany first came to France. Slowly, very slowly since the second quarter of the nineteenth century Goethe knowledge grew. Italian refugees landing in Catalonia bring the first authentic works of Goethe to Spain and make a Goethe enthusiast out of Pablo Piferrer (1818-1848). Angula y Herdia lectured on Goethe in the Ateneo at Madrid (1863). Since the middle of the century a Goethe interest definitely does exist and *Hermann und Dorothea*, *Faust*, *Egmont*, *Tasso*, *Götz*, *Iphigenie*, *Clavigo*, the ballads are well received; the *Wahlverwandtschaften* are rejected and the *Italienische Reise* is considered a travel-guide. The lyric poems enjoy editions, comments, discussions but the first Goethe biography appears in 1878 only. The situation in Latin America is worse. There everything still goes through the French translations and is inorganically grafted upon a precarious civilization which wants to reject the Spanish heritage.

Traditional Catholic Spain shows little enthusiasm for Goethe, although her most learned representatives, the literary historians Milá y Fontanals (1818-1884) and his greater pupil Menéndez Pelayo studied Goethe intensively and gave objective scholarly appraisals of his genius and his significance as the greatest literary event of the nineteenth century. The slim sector of liberal Spain, the anticlerical Krausistas and the educators of the Giner de los Rios-type tried to

assimilate Goethe to their rather confused ideas about German idealism but always voiced reservations against Goethe's alleged eroticism and immorality. Only in recent times there are a few sincere Goethe enthusiasts in Spain as well as in Latin America who understood the poet and the man, at least, to a certain degree, among them primarily Unamuno, Santayana, Eugenio d'Ors, Ortega y Gasset and Alfonso Reyes. Nevertheless Goethe's single works were much translated and there exist even incomplete Spanish editions of Goethe's "complete works," the first by Juan Maragall, the leader of the Catalan Renaissance, and the latest by Rafael Cansinos Assens (3 vols., 1950).

The judgments on Goethe's works throughout a century given in extenso throw more light on the Spanish mentality than any theoretical considerations. Spaniards did not feel at ease with Werther because the social status of Lotte is not clear (country lass or señorita?) and the book appears a guide to embracing, kissing and perversion; or conversely it is silly because Werther, if he is in love with Lotte does not act as a Don Juan without any consideration of friendship; it is the story of a sissy and a coquettish girl. Such ideas are ever in the mind of Pío Baroja and Pérez de Ayala. *Faust* is considered the hero of modern skepticism, has no religious goal, is boring, anecdotic, reveals the erotic obsession of an old galant lover, is romantic nihilism made transcendent; Gretchen is a stupid woman (Baroja), the Faust problem is the senseless illusion of progress.

On the other hand *Hermann und Dorothea* is praised as "a chaste, immaculate" poem; *Iphigenie* as of "a moral altitude to arouse the envy of Sophocles," as a "doctrine of the mission of woman in life." *Wilhelm Meister* is the vague epic of dilettantism and it is shocking that the hero finally becomes a surgeon (Ortega!). The lyrical poems are admired for their sincerity, but the *Römische Elegien* and similar works are condemned as the fundamentally immoral production of an egoistic seducer (even by Maragall). The ballads are loved as akin to the Spanish *Romances*, the weird ones are preferred.

As interesting as the judgments are, the influences of Goethe's works on Spanish poetry, always given with circumspection and fairness are no less revealing. If the influence on Rubén Darío has not been exaggerated, Goethe is even the father of *Modernismo* poetry in Spain and his symbolic nature imagery for the expression of love would still make him a living force in the mid-century poems of today.

The acknowledgment of the "pagan harmony" in Goethe, the man, was the hardest task for Spain and even those who praise him on

that score have their reservations against the olympian who dares to ignore original sin. Herr Rusker believes none the less that in contradistinction to similar inroads from the North which affected the Spanish élite earlier (Erasmus in the sixteenth, Voltaire in the eighteenth century) Goethe seems to have incorporated Spain to Europe for good. The present critic is not so sure of this, however. His doubts are based on the superficial judgments on Goethe in general, coming from his greatest Spanish admirers. How could Ortega compare Goethe to Chateaubriand? and call his analysis of life "a cultural intellectualism of unrelated thought"?—how could Maragall joke he was in danger to become a pantheist when reading Goethe?—how could Giner de los Rios find in Goethe art for art's sake?—how could Jorge Santayana speak of Goethe's classicism as a "moral somnambulism"?—how could González Blanco find in him "a wild hatred of the Cross"?—how could Unamuno see in him an atheist with the same understanding both for paganism and Christianity?—how could the contemporary Mexican philosopher José Vasconcelos apply to Goethe the slogan created by count Kayserling "of the aristocracy of the taxidivers"?—and how could Ernesto Giménez Caballero call him a barbarian, and the Argentinian Alberto Gerschunoff a "plaster Jupiter?"

These judgments gathered from a much larger collection offered by Herr Rukser may also give an idea of the concrete wealth of the book under discussion. Excellent charts and indices make the interesting volume still more precious.

Catholic University of America

HELMUT HATZFELD

Victor Hugo, *Notre-Dame de Paris*, ed., Marius-François Guyard (Paris: Garnier, 1959. xxxiii + 603 pp. 9 plates. Classiques Garnier). THIS illustrated volume is equipped with an Introduction (33 pages), concise footnotes, genealogical tables, two brief bibliographies, and 23 pages of selected variants. On the whole, the excellent standard of the recent Garnier edition of *Les Misérables* is well maintained (*MLN*, LXXIV, 4 [1959], 372-74).

In the Introduction, there is a discussion of the influence of Walter Scott, who oriented Hugo towards the historical novel, and whom Hugo already desired to emulate at the age of seventeen. Attention

is called to *Quentin Durward*, which interested Hugo in the reign of Louis XI, and to *Peveril of the Peak*, with its "dancing fairy" Fenella, who was a model for la Esmeralda (p. vii). While there is mention also of Hugo's admiration for Chateaubriand, the account of the literary sources of *Notre-Dame de Paris* seems incomplete. For example, some reference might have been made to Cervantes, whose *Preciosa* had much in common with la Esmeralda, and whose *Andres Caballero*, bitterly regretting his weakness for a gypsy girl, uses language anticipatory of the laments of Claude Frollo.

Professor Guyard is especially effective in describing Victor Hugo's influence upon himself. For instance, he shows that in *Notre-Dame de Paris* Hugo repeats earlier devices and clichés, or perhaps whole scenes, as from *Bug-Jargal* (p. x). Nevertheless, it is a question whether the editor does not exaggerate somewhat the autobiographical element in our novel. For example, he is not satisfied to identify the torment of Victor Hugo, quarreling with Sainte-Beuve, with that of Frollo. He goes so far as to call Frollo, because of his torment, the "véritable héros du roman" (p. xiv). Thus Professor Guyard comes to differ sharply from those more orthodox critics who would personify the cathedral, and make it the hero.

An important feature of the Introduction is the discussion of the text (pp. xix-xx). Here Professor Guyard gives his arguments for rejecting the readings of both the Hetzel-Quantin edition and Paul Meurice's *Edition de l'imprimerie nationale* (E. I. N.). He prefers to attempt a critical text, based upon the edition of 1832, making occasional corrections with the aid of the manuscript.

In at least one instance, Professor Guyard might have gone further, and checked also the footnotes with the manuscript. Victor Hugo wrote: "C'était une de ces fameuses cages à prisonniers d'état qu'on appelait les *fillettes du roi*" (p. 493). For this passage, Professor Guyard comments: "Un texte de Commynes (II, 321) montre clairement que l'expression désignait non les cages mais les fers de certains prisonniers du roi." However, he might have noted that in the *reliquat* Hugo writes correctly: "Cages de fer où les prisonniers étaient attachés avec d'énormes chaînes appelées les *fillettes du roi*" (MS. fo. 448^b). Hugo's later incorrect definition of *fillettes du roi*, it would thus be evident, was due not to ignorance, but to lack of time, causing him to overlook in copying the words "énormes chaînes."

I hasten to add, however, that on the whole the footnotes seem quite satisfactory, with one other exception. A footnote is badly needed

for Hugo's curious account of the legislation governing gypsy marriages, for which he cites as his authority "*Burington's Observations*" (pp. 110-111). As F. M. Warren pointed out in 1893, "*Burington's Observations*" is an error for Daines Barrington (1727-1800), *Observations on the More Ancient Statutes* (Dublin, 1766). However, as I have been unable to find the legislation in question in the Dublin, 1767, edition, I am tempted to conclude that we have here an inaccurate second hand quotation by Hugo.

It is now time to consider the "*Choix de variantes*," for which the editor claims a certain completeness. He says: "*on trouvera dans les notes critiques le relevé à peu près complet des additions faites à la rédaction originelle, soit dans les marges, soit même entre les lignes; . . .*" (p. xx). A careful check will show fairly numerous omissions of such "*additions*," but let one example suffice. Beginning with the words "*Au bout d'un instant*," (p. 65, third paragraph), there is a manuscript insertion of about one-third of a page (MS fo. 35^a). This addition, not noted by the editor, refers to the disappearance of Gringoire's *symphonie*. It is important, because it illustrates Hugo's method of piling up *contretemps*, for cumulative effect.

Regrettable also is the omission of the scenarios of 1828? and 1830? (E. I. N., pp. 430-431).

In spite of very minor shortcomings, however, teachers and students will find this attractive volume very practical for classroom use.

The Ohio State University

OLIN H. MOORE

Charles Augustin Sainte-Beuve, *Correspondance générale, tome septième, 1847-1849, nouvelle série, tome I*, ed. Jean Bonnerot (Paris: Didier, and Toulouse: Privat, 1957. 529 pp.). Charles Augustin Sainte-Beuve, *Correspondance générale, tome huitième, 1849-51, nouvelle série, tome II*, ed. Jean Bonnerot (Paris: Didier, and Toulouse: Privat, 1958. 404 pp.). HERE at long last are the extremely important volumes covering the period which includes the stove-pipe affair, S.-B.'s decision to leave Paris, his year at Liège, the ruptures with Buloz and Juste Olivier, the death of his mother, and his settling down to the weekly grind of *Lundis* to be produced for Dr. Véron's *Constitutionnel*. With a new publisher, and after painful vicissitudes only hinted at in the "Introduction" to VII, Bonnerot

has produced an instrument which is essential—though to a necessarily limited group.

S.-B. continues to be the world's least interesting letter writer. He emerges as a middle-aged man who feels older than his years, harried by insecurity, looking for and at last finding a source of regular income, and meanwhile too busy, too tired, too plagued by writer's cramp and sore eyes to be able to write, most often, anything but very perfunctory notes. These are surrounded, however, by a wealth of documentation which makes this edition not only a model of bibliography but the best possible day-to-day guide to the literary life of the period.

But as S.-B.'s life goes on B.'s difficulties increase with the rising amount of circumstantial detail to be controlled. Examples taken from a short section: B. forgets A. Delattre's work on Juste Olivier (VIII, 22-23); he does not make it clear that the "malade" in letter 2236 is Mme d'Arbouville—note 5 on p. 42 should come here (VIII, 35); the question of the "signature" in letter 2348 is not elucidated (VIII, 55); on the other hand, information about S.-B.'s Friday meetings with Véron is repeated (VIII, 71 ff.); B.'s remark that S.-B.'s description of himself as a drudge *will be* frequent comes after S.-B.'s has already so described himself several times (VIII, 97—letter 2365, n. 1.); etc. These are not signs of bad or even careless editing, but they do inspire wonder as to the possibilities of greater fatigue and confusion in the future.

One notes also that in changing publishers B. must also have been deprived of the type-setters and proof-readers who formerly did such an excellent job of converting his *fiches* into print. VIII swarms with typos, in themselves harmless because one can detect and correct them,¹ but disconcerting because their number suggests the possibility of less detectable ones, such as might turn up in arabic numerals. Lacking B.'s famous *apparatus*, one can not verify.

Since B. began this enterprise, thirty years ago, prices and labor costs have risen. Most of the defects one notices in the present volumes are nothing that a little money could not take care of. Rich foundations have supported less deserving projects and could well back this one. Clearly, he needs a hand.

Harvard University

W. M. FROHOCK

¹At times with difficulty: for "le vol de Louis-Marie Marchand . . ." (VIII, 72) read "le vol. . . ." and for "la ruée de l'or vers la Californie . . ." (VIII, 121) read "la ruée vers l'or de la Californie. . . ."

James M. Clark, ed. and trans., *Meister Eckhart. An Introduction to the Study of His Works with an Anthology of His Sermons* (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1957. 267 pp. \$6.25). THIS volume consists of a substantial and learned introduction, followed by translations of twenty-five of Eckhart's vernacular sermons and of two trial documents, with a full bibliography and an index. It has since been followed by another volume, done by Professor Clark in collaboration with John V. Skinner (New York: Harper, [1958]), including additional sermons and the principal treatises, from both Latin and German. Together the two volumes provide for English readers a thorough and fairly complete introduction to the safely authenticated writings of Meister Eckhart. Part One of the volume under discussion here is a treatise of well over 100 pages, including a brief biography, an analysis of Eckhart's thought, an appraisal of his style, and a competent survey of the intricate textual problems.

Professor Clark's work is thorough and scholarly in every way and will serve a useful purpose for those readers who already have some background in medieval philosophy but cannot easily read Eckhart in either his original Middle High German or in modern German translation. One must hasten to add, however, that Clark's English edition has considerable to offer even to those who can read modern German, for it is in some respects superior to existing modern German versions.

Clark's translation of the sermons is accurate, lucid, and fluent; but its general tone seems somewhat less popular and direct than the original Middle High German. This tendency is in accord with the translator's conscious purpose. If some earlier renditions—including the 1941 translation by R. B. Blakney into what Clark calls "American English"—are of a popular, devotional character, meeting the needs of readers with mystic inclinations akin to those of Eckhart's original vernacular audience; the aims of Clark are more scholarly, indeed scholastic: His introduction and many of his footnotes are expressly designed to establish Eckhart's identity with the main currents of orthodox medieval Christian philosophy.

The result is a certain dualism which, to be sure, is not without basis in Eckhart himself. Clark admits that Eckhart is essentially a mystic and even devotes 17 pages of his introduction to discussing him as such—after a section of 56 pages on the scholastic "theologian and philosopher." But, as Eckhart is quoted in the introduction to the companion volume by Clark and Skinner, "Wiltû den kernen

haben, sô muostû die schalen brechen." Clark is convinced that the scholastic shell is of greater value to English readers than the mystic kernel. But the kernel too he sees quite differently from most critics and, in particular, from Pope John XXII, whose Bull of 27 March, 1329, is the last document translated in the volume under discussion. In Clark's view, there was an Augustinian and particularly Neo-Platonic tendency in Eckhart, which nevertheless would have remained safely within the limits of medieval orthodoxy if Eckhart, the scholar and theologian, had not been too readily carried away by the daring metaphors of Eckhart, the popular vernacular "poet." "He was a man of imagination, and must be judged accordingly when we come across his daring flights of fancy. The tendency to take his remarks too literally is to be avoided" (p. 104). This poetic or fanciful tendency is, of course, particularly marked in the vernacular sermons presented in the volume under discussion here. The other side of Eckhart, the medieval philosopher delighting in the intellectual acrobatics of scholasticism, is better represented in the selection translated from the Latin Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John in the companion volume. The divergent tendencies in the sources themselves confront us with the question: Were the heterodox mystical utterances of the vernacular sermons mere "flights of fancy" departing only in their injudicious metaphors from the sound orthodoxy of the (mostly fragmentary) Latin tractates; or were the scholastic tours de force of the Latin Commentary on St. John rather an attempt to guide the mind encumbered by scholastic tradition into avenues of thought that might eventually prepare it for the mystic propositions which Eckhart dared utter directly to a less sophisticated, less tradition-bound audience in his sermons and in some of his vernacular treatises? (The Commentary is concerned with the relation of the Word with God, of emanation in general with essence; the sermons discuss the continuous "begetting" of God as Son in the human soul.) But Professor Clark puts the problem this way:

Most of the interpretations of Eckhart fall into three main categories. First, there is the view that he was a medieval Catholic, a pupil of Thomas Aquinas, orthodox in intention, if not always in actual fact. He was, if we accept this opinion, led astray by the influence of Neoplatonism to say things which are hardly compatible with orthodox Christianity. . . . The second type of interpretation labels him as a Neoplatonist without any qualification. He taught, so we are told, the identity of the soul in its ground or essence with God. . . . Nowadays we do not hear so much of the third view, that he was a precursor of the Reformation (pp. 118 f.).

Professor Clark struggles to cling to the first of these three interpretations because he wants to retain both mysticism and orthodoxy. From several pages of his chapter on "The Mystic" it would appear as though he too were telling us that Eckhart teaches "the identity of the soul in its ground or essence with God." But then this becomes qualified: It "does not mean that the soul is divine in the sense in which we say that God is Divine. It means that the soul is illuminated by light from above, that it reflects the Divine light as a mirror reflects the light of the sun. Unfortunately, Eckhart does not always make this clear" (p. 90). The last sentence quoted is surely a choice bit of euphemistic understatement, much as we may agree that Eckhart does not treat the ground of the soul and God as absolute identities or that his mysticism in general is far more restrained than that of some subsequent Germans in the Neo-Platonic tradition.

Other examples of Clark's tortuous effort to rehabilitate Eckhart's orthodoxy are afforded in his footnotes to the sermons. A sentence in Sermon XVI reads: "When God looks at the creature He gives it its being; when the creature looks at God it receives its being." The note to this passage points out "the careful distinction between the being of God and that of the creatures, which is orthodox" (p. 203). With this one might concur, if the Sermon had not just stated one page before: "Now man should so live that he may be one with the only-begotten Son, and that he may be the only-begotten Son. Between the only-begotten Son and the soul there is no distinction." Is this orthodox too, or is it merely a "flight of fancy?"

In short, this volume by Clark together with the companion volume by Clark and Skinner constitute the most nearly complete and the most learned introductions to Meister Eckhart that have so far been provided for the English-reading public. But for all its scholarship, this edition cannot be called objective. The "kernel" provided in the translated text of the sermons is authentic, but the introduction and notes attempt to press it into a "shell" that does not fit.

Washington University

RAYMOND IMMERWAHR

Richard Alewyn, *Über Hugo von Hofmannsthal* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958. 170 pp.). IN scholarly writing it is often as difficult as in the works of poetry to draw a clear dividing

line between "form" and "content." But whoever reads this collection of nine essays on Hofmannsthal, distant as they are from one another in time and method, will be aware of a dimension shared by all of them and yet too rarely present in the products of literary criticism: the dimension of style. It is admirable, and would be uncanny if it were not for the utter naturalness and ease of his expression, to observe how the author apparently finds the only fitting and plausible tone for each of his modes of discourse: flamboyant rhetoric in "Hofmannsthals Wandlung," originally the text of a public address; logical acumen and circumstantial marshaling of facts in "Andreas und die 'Wunderbare Freundin,'" prototype of the scholarly research article; thoughtful self-questioning and gentle suggestiveness in "Hofmannsthal und diese Zeit," an essay in which the imaginative but incommensurable task is undertaken to separate the time-bound from the imperishable elements in Hofmannsthal's work and personality; interpretative recapitulation and *Einführung* in "Hofmannsthals Anfang: *Gestern*," "Der Tod des Ästheteten," and "Hofmannsthals erste Komödie," masterpieces of textual analysis. But it is in the essay on Hofmannsthal's correspondence, entitled "Unendliches Gespräch," that Mr. Alewyn's extraordinary ability to capture the vibrations of his subject celebrates its most spectacular triumph. With the supple instrument of his language he not only paints a complex and convincing intellectual portrait of the poet's four correspondents Strauss, George, Borchardt, and Bodenhausen, but also outlines the different sides of Hofmannsthal's being which he turned forth, deliberately or inadvertently, in his relationship with each of these men. In this process, there emerges at the same time a characterization of four new spiritual entities, the four collections of letters, each of which is distinct from the mere sum of the two participants. This essay can be regarded as a book review in its purport, if one will, but it is certainly the perfection of the genre.

With their rich vocabulary, their suspense-filled syntax, and their melodious cadences these papers lend themselves to reading aloud like stories of poetic fiction and represent the German language at its expository best. Their collection in book form revealed to me a fact which I had not so clearly discerned in my occasional reading of Mr. Alewyn's scattered articles: that he is with scarcely a doubt one of the (if not *the*) leading stylists among the present generation of German literary historiographers.

As far as content is concerned, this volume, inconspicuously entitled

"On Hugo von Hofmannsthal," is not less profound than its style is brilliant. Independently, all of these essays whose dates of origin range from 1935 to 1956 were, of course, known to those interested in the Austrian poet. But again their appearing contiguously in one book opens up a depth of perspective which was absent from their existence separate in space and time. The author himself, in a very brief prefatory note, calls attention to one of the points of view from which these articles might appear as a unit: "Dass alle . . . Teile durch gewisse Grundgedanken unterirdisch verknüpft sind, die an verschiedenen Stellen aufgegriffen und abgewandelt werden, wird dem aufmerksamen Leser nicht entgehen."

I can only suggest a few of the connecting themes Mr. Alewyn may have had in mind. The most obvious and fundamentally important of these is the repeated attempt at correcting the outmoded and yet tenacious label of the sickly aesthete by which the Austrian poet had been misrepresented for so long. By pointing out tirelessly Hofmannsthal's committedness to "life" in his earliest epistolary ("Jugendbriefe von Hofmannsthal") as well as poetic manifestations ("Hofmannsthals Anfang: *Gestern*"), Mr. Alewyn succeeds in developing the figure of the "poète engagé" who was not only the creator but also the judge and critic of his decadent characters ("Der Tod des Ästheten"). A glance at the dates will convince those to whom this facet of the Hofmannsthal legend does not seem to be novel that Mr. Alewyn was one of the first to propound such an interpretation. Certainly this is not to signify that Hofmannsthal did not have to change, that all the elements of his future intellectual make-up were patent from adolescence on. On the contrary, Mr. Alewyn never ceases to describe—and this is another of his leitmotifs—the profound transformations his poet had to undergo. And this leads to still another of the themes coming up at various points: it is precisely the explanation of these painful processes that obeyed psychological and artistic laws peculiar to Hofmannsthal alone. Thus a few threads do run through the whole book giving to the richness of its images the cohesion of a fabric so that, in spite of Mr. Alewyn's pessimistic statement: ". . . als Ganzes kann dieses Buch seinen fragmentarischen Charakter nicht verleugnen" (Vorrede), the total impression is a rather well-rounded picture of Hofmannsthal as an artist and as a personality.

The modesty of the paper-back edition (Die kleine Vandenhoeck-Reihe) is deceptive as to the value of Mr. Alewyn's book. From nine

critical gems it emits prismatically the radiant light of a true encounter between a great poet and a great critic and should be indispensable not only to admirers of Hugo von Hofmannsthal but also to lovers of the German language.

Harvard University

EGON SCHWARZ

Arndt Ruprecht, *Die ausgehende Wikingerzeit im Lichte der Runeninschriften* (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958. 188 pp. Palaestra, 224).

THIS interesting book is an attempt to rewrite the history of the late Viking Age on the basis of runic inscriptions. For that purpose the material of 2,500 inscriptions is limited to the still many inscriptions dealing with Vikings and traders and scrutinized for every information it will yield, and that is surprisingly much, for very often the stones tell not only in whose honor the stone was carved and by whom, but also how old the Viking was and where he "became dead" whether on a Viking expedition in the West or in the East. You may also get a more or less clear picture of the Viking's family relationships, from grandfather to sons or daughters, or his status in the expedition whether a leader or a comrade and his personal qualities (*drengr góðr*). The sagas give the impression that Viking raiding was primarily the occupation of young men, the stones prove that it was the business of mature men. The stones also give the provenience of the Vikings, whether from Denmark, Gautland, Suðrmanland or Uppland. They also show the routes of the Viking expeditions, in Russia in early times along the Volga later among the Dnjepr to Byzants or even to the mysterious Serkland and in the West along the shores and rivers of the British Isles or France, or even the Mediterranean.

The author divides his material in four chapters (1) the political history of the vaning Viking Age, (2) the development of trade in the vaning Viking Age, (3) Vikings and traders, (4) and the Christian mission in the light of the culture of the runic inscriptions. In an *Excursus* the author narrates the history of two semi-royal or noble landowning families of the eleventh century on the shores of the Mälaren Lake on the basis of runic inscriptions carved by members of these two families. The author prints all his runic texts with translations; these are the texts dealing with Scandinavian Vikings

or traders in foreign parts; he also has texts pertaining to the church and finally some dealing with women. Since the author's approach is historical, he excludes rightly all uncertain inscriptions, but though a historian, he also has many observations of interest to the linguist, especially in dealing with the meaning of words.

Finally there are many maps of the lands where the Vikings roamed or lived, notably maps of the distribution of runic inscriptions in Denmark and Sweden.

The results of his investigation are summarized by the author as follows. Weakness and non-belligerency of the East and West invited the Viking raids to begin with. At the end of the Viking Age there was a general strengthening and consolidation of the victimized countries, partly aided and abetted by the Scandinavians themselves.—In the beginning the Vikings followed the merchants on their routes, later the Vikings turned traders themselves.—The Churches were especially the butts of the early Vikings. They retaliated by sending missionaries to Scandinavia and converting the natives. Then the natives in turn turned missionaries converting the Baltic lands.—Especially fruitful culturally were Scandinavian settlements founded by the Vikings over sea.

This is a fine book well done.

The Johns Hopkins University

STEFAN EINARSSON

ured,
roach
nough
guis,

oamed
ons in

nor a
nvited
there
com-
s.—h
route,
wer
ending
en the
nds.—
pounde

SSON

ge Notu

ard,
road
ough
guis,

amed
as in

or a
vited
then
coun-
—In
utes,
were
ading
n the
ds-
andel

SON

Nota

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Power of Satire

Magic, Ritual, Art

By Robert C. Elliott

From its earliest manifestations in primitive magic and incantation to its use by such skilled modern writers as Wyndham Lewis and Roy Campbell, satire has enjoyed an amazing continuity despite its variety. Mr. Elliott links satire's origins to its modern counterpart, revealing how sophisticated literary satire has evolved. He traces its evolution from magic and ritual through the formal verse satire of Rome, the rich literature of medieval Ireland, and such well-known masterpieces as *Timon of Athens*, *Le Misanthrope*, *Gulliver's Travels*, to modern satire. His study reveals not only the vital literary life of satire, but the place of the satirist in society.

312 pages, \$6.00

God, Man, and Satan

Patterns of Christian Thought and Life in *Paradise Lost*, *Pilgrim's Progress*, and the Great Theologians

By Roland Mushat Frye

In this highly original literary study, Mr. Frye treats Milton's *Paradise Lost* as a Christian vision of reality and Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* as an allegory of the Christian life. He sees these writings both as art and as theological expression, and his analysis penetrates each aspect. These two works are found to speak with relevance to the present-day theological ferment, and the contributions of such modern thinkers as Kierkegaard, Niebuhr, and Tillich illumine the design of these two 17th century classics. "Highly commendable and courageous . . . outside the usual line of historical elucidation of both works by literary scholars."—Douglas Bush.

176 pages, \$3.75

La Mettrie's *L'Homme Machine*

A Study in the Origins of an Idea

By Aram Vartanian

Although the man-machine idea was not original with La Mettrie, his was the first thoroughgoing statement of a mechanistic theory of mind, which laid the foundation of modern physiological psychology. This edition offers the first established text of *L'Homme Machine*, with extensive notes. In his critical introduction Aram Vartanian discusses La Mettrie's thesis, examines its sources, and assesses the place of the man-machine idea in the development of La Mettrie's materialism as well as its impact on the intellectual struggles of the 18th century.

264 pages, \$6.00

Order from your bookstore, or

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS, Princeton, New Jersey

selected



spring books

E. E. Cummings

THE ART OF HIS POETRY

by Norman Friedman
224 pages \$4.00

By analyzing in full the themes, forms, and stylistic devices as they appear in the poems, the author questions the myths surrounding Cummings' poetry, points out the evolution of his style, and examines the facts underlying the creative processes of this meticulous craftsman.

André Malraux

THE CONQUEST OF DREAD

by Gerda Blumenthal
176 pages \$4.00

Through image and symbol, through the heroes of his novels, Malraux seeks to confront and exorcise the powers of darkness and to repossess for modern man "the world from which despair has disinherited him." The author's penetrating study revolves around this concept.

Image and Meaning

METAPHORIC TRADITIONS IN RENAISSANCE POETRY

by Don Cameron Allen
192 pages \$4.00

An explication of eight well-known poems of the English Renaissance according to the previous use of their metaphors and themes by Greek, Latin, medieval, and contemporary continental poets.

Apollo and the Nine

A HISTORY OF THE ODE

by Carol Maddison
440 pages \$6.50

Beginning with its inception in Pindar, the author traces the development of the ode, describes the types of odes—Classical, Humanist, Italian, French, English—and the ways in which poets utilized and modified the form.

Order from your bookstore or:

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

Baltimore 18, Maryland